

THE TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES
IN THE EARLY ARAB CONQUESTS
A.D. 634 - 656

b y

D. R. Hill

Bachelor of Science (Hons.) in Engineering of the
University of London 1949

Master of Letters of the University of Durham 1964

Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers

Member of the Institute of Linguists

Thesis presented for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of London

March 1970

ProQuest Number: 11010373

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 11010373

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

8.9.70.



ABSTRACT

The work deals with the Arab conquests from the first invasions of foreign territory up to the death of 'Uthmān. The subject-matter comprises the reduction, pacification and occupation of the conquered areas, data being drawn from the major Arabic sources, from some Persian local histories, and from two Christian historians. A computer was used to assist in processing the information, the resulting documents being used in sorting, presenting and analysing the data.

The work consists of the following sections:

- I. Introduction.
- II. List of Primary sources, Secondary works and Isnāds.
- III. Appraisal of the Sources.
- IV. Reports and Commentaries by Regions.

For each region the reports on Terminations of Hostilities are presented systematically in categories, each report with full references. This list is followed by a Commentary, giving first a brief survey of the conquest, and then a discussion and evaluation of the reports.

- V. Analysis of the Reports and Conclusion.

The reports are considered as a whole, and are analysed by quantitative and qualitative methods.

In the Conclusion the results of the work are summarized and a brief assessment is made of the effect of the Terminations of Hostilities upon the outcome of the conquests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to Professor Bernard Lewis for his valuable advice and suggestions.

I would also like to thank Mr. F.R.C.Bagley, of the University of Durham, for his assistance over a number of years, and the staffs of the Libraries of the School of Oriental Studies, University of Durham, and the School of Oriental and African Studies.

Finally I would like to express my appreciation for the unfailing encouragement and support I have received from my wife.

CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
	Abstract	
	Acknowledgements	
I	Introduction	
II	List of Sources, Works, and <u>Isnāds</u> ..	
III	Appraisal of Sources	
IV	Reports and Commentaries by Regions..	
	A. Egypt and Nubia	
	B. North Africa	
	C. Syria	
	D. Al-Jazīra (Mesopotamia) ..	
	E. 'Irāq	
	F. South and Central Persia ..	
	G. North Persia	
	H. Armenia	
V	Analysis of Sources and Conclusion ..	

Section I - INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

i) Purpose and Scope of the Work

The purpose of this work is twofold: first, to present in a form readily available for reference the data given in the sources on the Termination of Hostilities - reports of treaties, conquests, and the terms imposed upon or agreed with the conquered peoples; secondly to evaluate the data, assess the reliability of the various reports, and estimate the military and political effects of these terminations of hostilities in the immediate aftermath of the early conquests.

The period chosen for research is from A.D. 634/A.H. 12 to A.D. 656/A.H. 35, i.e. from the first significant incursions into Byzantine and Sasānid territory until the death of 'Uthmān. This, it is felt, is a clearly defined period of the Muslim conquests, which saw the permanent conquest of Egypt, Greater Syria, 'Irāq, Mesopotamia, and the Iranian plateau, and the beginning of full-scale operations in North Africa, Northern Īrān, and Armenia. In this period also can be placed the beginnings of Muslim civil administration, the establishment of garrison towns, and the first considerable migrations of tribal Arabs into the conquered areas. This, the first phase of the Muslim expansion, ended at, or just before, the assassination of 'Uthmān. The internal dissensions which

preceded and followed this event, which are themselves partly attributable to the success of the first conquests, appear to have caused a prolonged hiatus in the progress of Muslim arms, a progress which was not resumed with full energy until the Umayyads were firmly installed in power.

The subject has also been limited in two other ways. It was felt advisable to confine discussion to land operations. Seaborne operations were mainly a later development, and would certainly repay further detailed study, which is, however, beyond the scope of the present work. Nor was it felt desirable to include a specific examination of legal or fiscal problems, except insofar as they impinge upon military considerations. The early figh authors were, of course, consulted for the valuable narratives of the conquests which they contain.

ii) Data Processing

In the sources there are many hundreds of reports on the termination of hostilities. Although many reports are similar, others show wide variations; treaties for Khurāsān, for instance, are quite different from treaties for Egypt, but, in addition, different reports for the same event often vary widely. The processing of this diverse data presented a certain problem, a difficult problem to resolve by conventional means, but one which lent itself

admirably to resolution by formal treatment. It was decided, therefore, to code the reports, record them on data processing sheets, then onto punched cards, and finally sort the accumulated information on a computer. An ordinary electro-mechanical sorter with printing facilities, although more cumbersome, would have been equally effective, but the computer was preferred for two reasons. First, it was readily accessible to the author, and secondly its use in this manner gave valuable experience for future developments of a more complex nature. The facility provided by a computer, for storing, and adding to, information on magnetic tape, and abstracting that information in the form required, especially if the output can give predictive results, obviously has wide applications for historical research.

The method adopted for the present work was as follows: each report was coded for sorting, the first major key being by area, to give a printout sorted into eight regions. The second, and most important, coding was by nine keys, each for a given statement. If that statement occurred a 'Y' for 'Yes' was inserted, if not a 'N' for 'No' was written. These statements were

1. guld 2. amān 3. dhimma 4. jizya 5. kharāj 6. tribute
7. other conditions 8. Shart 9. 'Ahd. The final, minor, key was by Hijra date.

All other relevant information - item no., source, isnād, place name, how the conquest was achieved, the contracting parties, and other details - was added on the data sheet, or on a separate handwritten card, or on both.

A simple COBOL program was then written for the computer (a Honeywell Series '200' machine) requesting two different reports:

1. Divided into regions, then sorted into terminations with identical terms, finally by Hijra date.

2. As 1. but not divided into regions.

These reports, together with the handwritten cards, then became the working documents for the preparation of the thesis in its final form.

The writer found that this approach offered several advantages. One was the convenience, once the coding had been established, of recording the date. More important was that one could defer the introduction of a typology until after the material had been coded and sorted, hence minimising the temptation to establish a pattern prematurely. Working with the computer facilitated orderly presentation of data, and moreover showed certain salient features at a glance e.g. the prevalence of 'tribute' type treaties in Khurāsān.

iii) Presentation

Section II lists the Primary sources, with the abbreviations used in references, the Secondary sources, and the Isnāds. All isnāds given were recorded and are included in this list, with the code which is used in the references.

Section III is a discussion of the sources.

This section is followed by the main part of the work, presented by regions, each region having first a list of reports, then an evaluation of these reports and an appreciation. The final section of the work is devoted to a brief analysis of the reports, and the Conclusion.

The regional sections, therefore, consist of two parts - attestations and commentary, and the two are kept quite separate. The reports are set down without comments, either upon their contents or their reliability, this evaluation being reserved for the second part of the section. The reports give either the substance of the text or an exact translation; in the latter case, the statement is placed in quotation marks.

The reports of terminations are listed according to a typology, which is considered to have significance, although other valid arrangements could perhaps be suggested. As mentioned above the reports were sorted totally by the application of nine 'yes-no' questions, so that the possible number of different types is obviously

2⁹ or 512. In fact over 70 different types were identified, but division into so large a number would have been cumbersome and artificial. After a careful examination of the material the following typology was therefore established:

Primary Types

- A. No sulḥ - i.e. 'anwatan or unspecified
- B. Sulḥ, but not amān or dhimma
- C. Sulḥ, with amān or dhimma or both.

Secondary Types

(Sorted within the primary types)

- 1. No other data.
- 2. Other conditions, but not tribute, jizya or kharāj.
(Obviously type A always excludes sulḥ, type B always excludes amān and/or dhimma.)
- 3. Tribute, other conditions, but not jizya or kharāj.
- 4. Kharāj, other conditions, but not jizya.
- 5. Jizya, other conditions, but not kharāj.
- 6. Kharāj and jizya and any other conditions.

The more complex the arrangement, therefore, the higher will be its alphanumeric rating. Type C6 could (but never does) include all the possible conditions of a negotiated peace.

Mention must now be made of the problem of definitions and the resolution of ambiguities. In the present case the principle was adopted of closely following the literal sense of the text in order to decide upon the appropriate category, leaving the discussion of dubious cases for the commentary. The method was as follows:

1. Four expressions, with technical connotations, are never used unless the actual word occurs in the text. These are: dhimma, kharāj, jizya, and 'ahd.
2. A treaty is classed as sulhan if the word sulh is used, as in the great majority of cases. Occasionally, events are put into this category, although the actual word does not occur, if the circumstances strongly indicate a settlement; e.g. there was no fighting, there were negotiations, there was an 'ahd. Occurrence of the terms 'anwatan or gasran naturally preclude the use of this category.
3. The event is put into category 'C' if the words amān or dhimma occur, or if it is stated that there was a prohibition on killing or taking captives.
4. Sharf is used if the word occurs, or if the validity of the treaty is said to depend upon the observance of its terms.
5. 'Tribute' is used as a general term covering all payments, when neither jizya or kharāj is mentioned. Sometimes 'tax'

is preferred if this is the unequivocal meaning of the text.

6. 'Other conditions' is self-explanatory, and covers conditions such as hospitality, religious restrictions, giving aid and advice etc. These are always given in full in the report.
7. Verbs are taken to have the same connotation as nouns for categorising - e.g. Amana for aman, salaha for sulh.
8. Where any of the key words occur in the text, they are given in transcribed form in the report. This makes for monotonous reading, but it is necessary in the interests of accuracy.

A discussion on the selection, use, and reliance placed on the various sources will be found in section III. Even from those sources used, however, it was impossible to make a fully comprehensive listing of all reports of Terminations of Hostilities. Omissions were of two kinds: first, if the subject is dealt with at great length by several authors, with many repetitions which have no important variations, then a representative selection of these reports was made, and an indication given of the provenance of those omitted. This applies particularly to the reports on the settlement of the Sawād in Abū 'Ubayd, Abū Yūsuf, and Balādhurī. The second category concerns passages where the writer was aware that undue attention had been given by the historian to quite minor episodes. This is most noticeable in the very lengthy

narrative in Ṭabarī devoted to the minor campaigns in 'Irāq between the battle of the Bridge and the battle of Qādisiyya particularly when compared with his summary treatment of the Syrian and Egyptian campaigns.

It is felt, nevertheless, that a wide coverage of the available data has been made, and that for important events an ample selection has been presented. Indeed, reports have been included despite the fact that they were felt to be suspect or even false. And for the events of less importance - captures of towns, villages, and small areas of land - the large majority of those given in the sources have been listed.

This work is not designed as a general history of the early Muslim conquests, although one would expect its substance to be contained in any such history. For the convenience of the reader, however, in each regional section, at the beginning of the commentary, a brief narrative of the main events of the conquest of that region has been given, accompanied by references to primary and secondary sources, but not to isnāds. In the preparation of these narratives the writer had recourse to the works of such authors as Butler, de Goeje, and particularly Caetani. These summaries are, however, merely a chronological framework upon which is built the following discussion of the Termination of Hostilities, and avoid, as far as is possible, controversial points which are dealt with in that discussion.

Section II

LIST OF SOURCES, WORKS, AND ISNĀDS

LIST OF SOURCES

<u>No.</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Chronology</u>
	(a) <u>Arabic</u>		
1.	Al-Ṭabarī: Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr.	T	224/839 - 310/923
	<u>Annales quos scripsit etc.</u> Ed. M.J. de Goeje, Leyden 1879- 1901; First Series.		
2.	Al-Balādhurī: Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Jābir b. Dāwūd.	B	Died 279/892
	<u>Liber Expugnationis Regionum</u> Ed. M.J. de Goeje, Leyden 1866.		
2a.	Idem. <u>The Origins of the Islamic State</u> English transaction by P.K.Hitti, New York 1916.		
3.	Al-Ya'qūbī: Aḥmad b. Abī Ya'qūb b. Wādīḥ.	Y	Died 284/897
	<u>Historiae</u> - Vol. II Ed. M.Th. Houtsma, Leyden 1883.		
4.	Al-Dīnawarī: Abū Ḥanīfa. <u>Al-Akhbar al-Ṭiwāl</u> Ed. V. Guirgass, Leyden 1888	D	Died 281/894
5a.	Al-Balādhurī: <u>Ansāb al-Ashraf</u> Istanbul M.S. Ashir Efendi 597/8 Vol II of the M.S.	Ansab II	

<u>No.</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Chronology</u>
5b.	Ibid.: Vol V of the Hebrew University Edition. Ed. S.D.Goitein, Jerusalem 1936. (Comprises pp. 918 - 1137 of the first vol. of the Istanbul M.S.) N.B. The first volume of the M.S. was studied, but apart from a few reports which were in the part edited by Goitein, no relevant information was found. Another part of the first volume of the M.S., covering pp. 1 - 281, has been edited and published by Muhammad Hamidullah (Cairo 1959) but as this deals with the period up to the death of the Prophet it also gave no relevant information. It was, however, invaluable for the com- plete index to the M.S. which it contains.	Ansab G	

<u>No.</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Chronology</u>
6.	Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam: Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh.	FM	182/798 - 257/871

Futūḥ Miṣr

Ed. C.C.Torrey, New Haven 1922

7.	Ibn 'Atham al-Kūfī: Abū Muḥammad Aḥmad	Ibn A'tham	Composed 204/819
----	--	------------	------------------

Futūḥ al-Bulḍān

Istanbul M.S. Ahmed III 2956

(Obtained in microfilm)

8.	Abū Yūsuf: Ya'qūb b. Ibrāhīm	AY	113/732 - 182/798
----	------------------------------	----	-------------------

Kitāb al-Kharāj

Bulaq, Cairo, 1308 A.H.

8a.	Idem: French translation by E. Fagnan, Paris 1921		
-----	---	--	--

9.	Abū 'Ubayd: al-Qāsim b. Sallām	AU	154/770 - 224/838
----	--------------------------------	----	-------------------

Kitāb al-Amwāl

Cairo 1353 A.H.

10.	Qudāma b. Ja'far	Q	250/864 - 320/932
-----	------------------	---	-------------------

Kitāb al-Kharāj

Part Seven in 'Taxation in Islam'

by A. Ben Shemesh, Vol. II

(English Translation) London 1965.

<u>No.</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Chronology</u>
	(b) <u>Persian</u>		
11.	Ibn Isfandiyyar: Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan.	MH	Compiled c. 613/1216
	<u>History of Tabaristan</u>		
	Edited and translated into English by E.G.Browne in Gibb Memorial Series, Leyden 1905.		
12.	Ḥasan b. Muḥammad Qummī. <u>Tārīkh-i-Qumm</u>	Qum	Arabic written 378/988
	Translated into Persian by Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Ḥasan b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Qummī. Ed. Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Tehrānī 2nd Edition, Tehrān 1353 A.H.		Persian translation 825/1422
13.	Al-Māfarrūkhī: Mufaḍḍal b. Sa'ad b. al-Ḥusayn <u>Muḥāsīn Isfahān</u>	Isf	Arabic written 421/1030
	Ed. 'Abbās Iqbāl, Tehrān 1949		Persian translation 729/1329
14.	Anon: <u>Tārīkh-i-Sīstān</u> Ed. Malik al-Shu'arā' Bihār Tehran 1314/1935	Sīstān	
15.	Al-Ḥākim al-Nīsābūrī: Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allah <u>Tārīkh Nīshābūr</u>	Nish	321/933 - 405/1014
	Ed. Bayman Karīmī. Tehrān 1339/1960.		

<u>No.</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Chronology</u>
	(c) <u>Coptic</u>		
16.	John of Nikiou: <u>Chronique de Jean, Evêque de Nikiou</u> Edited and French translation by M.H.Zotenberg, Paris 1883	JN	Written 693 - 700 AD
	(d) <u>Syriac</u>		
17.	Michael the Syrian: <u>Chronique de Michel le Syrien</u> Edited and French translation by J.B.Chabot, Paris 1901.	MS	Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, 116 - 1199 A.D.

LIST OF SECONDARY WORKS CONSULTED

Note: Except where otherwise stated,
these works are cited in the
footnotes by authors' surnames.

1. Brunchvig, Robert. Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam et la Conquête de
l'Afrique du Nord par les Arabes -
Étude Critique.

In 'Annales de l'Institut d'Études
Orientales', University of Algiers,
Vol. VI, 1942-1947, pp. 108-155.
2. Caetani, L. Annali dell'Islam. Milan, 1905-1926
(10 Vols.).

Cited as 'Ca' followed by the Hijra
year and the paragraph number.
3. Idem. Chronografia islamica. Paris, 1912 (5 Vols.).

Cited as 'Ca.Chron.' followed by the
Hijra year and the paragraph number.
4. Butler, A.J. The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the last
thirty years of the Roman dominion.

Oxford 1902.
5. Wellhausen, J. Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz.

Berlin 1902.

6. Dennett, D.C. Conversion and the Poll-Tax in Early Islam. Cambridge, Mass. 1950.
7. Schacht, J. A Revaluation of Islamic Traditions.
In Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,
1949, pp. 143-154.
8. Petersen, E.L. 'Alī and Mu'awiya in Early Arabic Tradition.
Copenhagen 1964.
9. Al-Dūrī, 'Abd al-'Azīz. Baḥṭh fī naṣh 'at 'ilm al-tārīkh 'ind al-'arab. Beirut 1960.
10. Khadduri, M. War and Peace in the Law of Islam.
Baltimore 1955
11. de Goeje, M.J. Memoire sur la conquête de la Syrie.
Leyden 1886.
12. Musil, A. Arabia Deserta. New York 1927.
13. Bosworth, C.E. Sīstān under the Arabs. Rome 1968.
14. Gibb, H.A.R. The Arab Conquests in Central Asia.
London 1923.
15. Glubb, J.B. The Great Arab Conquests. London 1963.
16. Beckmann, L. Die Muslimischen Heere der Eroberungszeit.
Hamburg, 1953 (Typewritten thesis).
17. Hill, D.R. The Mobility of the Arab Armies in the Early Conquests.
University of Durham 1964 (Typewritten thesis for M.Litt.).

18. Ḥamīdullah, M. Majmū'at al-Wathā'iq al-Siyāsiyya.
Cairo 1956.
19. Le Strange, G. The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate.
Second Edition, Cambridge, 1930.
(Not cited.)
20. Fisher, W.B. The Middle East - a Physical, Social
and Regional Geography.
London 1950. (Not cited.)
21. The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition.
References are given by title of
article and page.

ISNĀD LIST

(i) Unclassified - Code U

1. Sufyān b. Muḥammad from his father and shaykhs.
2. 'Amr b. Ḥammād b. Abī Ḥanīfa from Mālik b. Anas from Nāfi' from Aslam.
3. Abū 'Ubayd from Hishām b. 'Ammār from al-Walīd b. Muslim from al-Awzā'ī.
4. Muḥammad b. Sahm al-Anṭakī from his father Ṣāliḥ al-Farrā' from Makhḷad b. al-Ḥusayn from shaykhs of the Syrian frontier.
5. Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ju'fī from Ibn al-Mubārak from 'Abd Allah b. al-Walīd from 'Abd al-Malik b. Abī Ḥurra from his father.
6. Muḥammad b. al-Ṣabāḥ al-Bazzāz from Hushaym from Ismā'īl b. Abī Khālīd from Qays b. Abī Ḥāzim.
7. 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama from Ibn Wahb from Muḥammad b. 'Amr from Ibn Jurayj.
8. 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama from Ibn Wahb from Haywa b. Shūri from Bakr b. 'Amr from 'Abd Allah b. Hubayra.
9. Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb and Khālīd b. Ḥumayd.
10. Abū 'Ubayd from Sa'īd b. Abī Maryam from Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb from Ubayd Allah b. Abī Ja'far.
11. Aḥmad b. Thābit al-Rāzi from someone who heard Ishāq b. 'Isā mentioning this from Abū Ma'shar.

12. Al-Walīd b. Ṣalīḥ from Marḥūm al-Aḥḥār from his father.
13. Muḥammad b. al-Mufaḍḍal al-Mawṣilī from shaykhs of Sinjār.
14. Abū Ayyūb al-Mu'addab al-Raqqī from Abū 'Abd Allah al-Qarqasānī from his shaykhs.
15. Abū 'Ubayd from Ismā'īl b. Mujālid from his father from al-Sha'bī.
16. Hishām b. 'Ammār from Yaḥyā b. Ḥamza from Tanīm b. 'Aṭiyya from 'Abd Allah b. Qays al-Hamdānī.
17. Al-Ḥajjāj b. Abī Manī' alone.
18. 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama from Ibn Wahb from Abd Allah b. 'Umar and 'Umar b. Muḥammad from Nāfi' from Aslam, mawlā of Umar.
19. Shaybān b. Farrūkh from Abū 'Awāna from al-Mughīra from al-Saffāḥ al-Shaybānī.
20. Sa'īd b. 'Abd al-'Azīz from al-Waḍīn.
21. Hishām b. 'Ammār al-Dimashqī from Yaḥyā b. Ḥamza from Abū 'Abd al-'Azīz from 'Ubāda b. Nusayy from 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ghanm.
22. As 4.
23. Hishām b. 'Ammār from al-Walīd b. Muslim from Ṣafwān b. 'Amr.
24. Barmak b. 'Abd Allah and other Shaykhs of Dabīl.
25. Abū Ayyūn al-Raqqī from al-Ḥajjāj b. Abī Manī' from his father from his grandfather.
26. 'Amr b. Muḥammad from al-Ḥajjāj b. Abī Manī' from his father from his grandfather.

27. Al-Ḥajjāj b. Abī Manī' from shaykhs of Ra's al-'Ayn.
28. Abū Naṣr al-Tammār from Sharīk b. 'Abd Allah al-Nakha'ī from al-Ḥajjaj b. Arṭā from al-Ḥakam from 'Abd Allah b. Muḡhaffal.
29. 'Abbās b. Hishām from his father from 'Awāna b. al-Ḥakam; also from Abū 'Ubayda Ma'mar b. al-Muthannā from Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā'.
30. Al-Ḥusayn b. al-Aswad from Wakī' from Fuḡayl b. Ghazwān from 'Abd Allah b. Ḥāzim.
31. Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb - alone.
32. Abū 'Ubayd from 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from Mūsā b. 'Alī b. Ribāḥ al-Lajmī from his father.
33. 'Abbās b. Hishām from his father from his grandfather and 'Awāna b. al-Ḥakam.
34. Muḥammad b. Sa'd, client of Banū Ḥaṣhiḡ, from Mūsā b. Ism'ā'il from Sulaymān b. Muslim from his uncle, Bashīr b. Abī Umayya.
35. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Tamīmī from his shaykhs.
36. Al-Ḥusayn b. 'Amr al-Ardabīlī from Wāqid al-Ardabīlī from shaykhs.
37. Ishāq b. Sulaymān al-Shahrzūrī from his father from Muḥammad b. Marwān from al-Kalbī from some of the family of 'Azra al-Bājālī.
38. Ishāq b. Sulaymān al-Shahrzūrī from his father from shaykhs.
39. Not used.
40. Rawḥ b. 'Abd al-Mu'min from Ya'qūb from Abū 'Āṣim al-Rāmhurmuzī.
41. Ishāq b. Abī Isrā'īl from Ibn Mubārak from Ibn Jurayḥ from 'Aṭā' al-Khurāsānī.

42. 'Umar b. Ḥaḥṣ al-'Umārī from Abū Ḥudhayfa from Abū al-Ashhab from Abū Rajā'.
43. Ma'mar b. al-Muthannā and others.
44. Ibn Wahb from 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Shariḥ.
45. 'Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ - alone.
46. Ḥaḥṣ b. 'Umar from al-Haytham b. 'Adī.
47. Hānī b. al-Mutawakkil from Mūsā b. Ayyūb; and Rishdīn b. Sa'd from al-Ḥasan b. Thawbān from Ḥusayn b. Shafayy.
48. 'Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ from Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb.
49. 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from Yaḥyā b. Ayyūb from 'Ubayd Allah b. Abī Ja'far.
50. 'Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ from Ibn Wahb from Ibn An'am from shaykhs.
51. Yaḥyā b. Khālīd from Rishdīn b. Sa'd from 'Aqīl b. Khālīd from Ibn Shihāb.
52. Sa'id b. Ufayr - alone.
53. Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb - alone.
54. Dāwūd b. Abī Hind - alone.
55. Shaykhs of Ghassān.
56. Abū 'Uthmān and Jāriya.
57. Salīm b. 'Abd Allah - alone.
58. 'Abd Allah b. Aḥmad b. Shabbuyeh al-Marawzī from his father from Sulaymān b. Ṣāliḥ from 'Abd Allah from 'Ubayd Allah b. Sulaymān from a client of Banū Abī al-'Ās.

59. 'Abd Allah b. Kathīr al-'Abdī from Ja'far b. 'Awn from Abu Janāb from Abū al-Mahajjal from Makhlad al-Bakrī from 'Alqama b. Marthad from Sulaymān b. Burayda.
60. Bakr b. 'Abd al-'Azīz from Abū 'Alī 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Isā b. Ḥamād Hamdānī; also from Abū 'Ubayd, Shāfi'i, and Malik.
61. Mujālid from al-Sha'bī.
62. Some of the shaykhs of al-Saffāḥ from Dāwūd b. Kurdūs from 'Ubāda b. al-Nu'mān al-Taghlabī.
63. Some of Ahl al-'Ilm from Makḥūl al-Shāmī.
64. 'Abd Allah b. Sa'īd b. Abū Sa'īd from his grandfather.
65. Ibn al-Kalbī and others.
66. Abū Mu'āwiya from Abū Ishāq al-Shaybānī from al-Saffāḥ from Dāwūd b. Kurdūs.
67. Ismā'īl b. Ja'far from Isrā'īl from Abū Ishāq from Ḥaritha b. al-Muḍarrib.
68. Kathīr b. Hishām from Ja'far b. Burqān from Maymūn b. Mihrān.
69. Hushaym b. Bushayr from Al-'Awwām b. Ḥawshab from Ibrāhīm al-Taymī.
70. Al-Anṣārī Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allah and (perhaps) Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm from Sa'īd b. Abī 'Arwa from Qatada from Abu Mijlaz from Ibn Ḥumayd.
71. As 15.
72. Al-Ḥasan b. Ṣāliḥ from al-Aswad b. Qays from his father.
73. Hishām b. 'Ammār from Yazīd b. Samūra from al-Ḥakam b. 'Abd

al-Raḥmān b. Abī al-‘Aṣmā’ al-Khath‘amī, who witnessed the fall of Caesarea.

74. Huṣḥaym from Muḥammad b. Qays from al-Sha‘bī.
75. Ḥassān b. ‘Abd Allah from Bakr b. Maḍar from ‘Ubayd Allah b. Abī Ja‘far.
76. Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna from Abū Ishāq from Ḥarītha b. Muḍarrib.
77. Hishām b. ‘Ammār from Ismā‘īl b. ‘Ayyās.
78. Hishām b. ‘Ammār from al-Haytham b. ‘Ammār al-‘Anasī from his grandfather.
79. Abu Mushir from Sa‘īd b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. N.B. The 'sh' does not have a line under.
80. Muḥammad b. Kathīr from al-Awzā‘ī from Ibn Surāqa.
81. Kathīr b. Hishām from Ja‘far b. Burqān from al-Ma‘mar b. Ṣāliḥ from al-‘Alā’b. Abī ‘Ā’isha.
82. Aḥmad b. al-Azraq - an Armenian.
83. Nu‘aym b. Ḥammād from ‘Abd Allah b. al-Mubārak from Abd Allah b. al-Walīd from ‘Abd al-Malik b. Abī Ḥurra from his father.
84. Abū al-Yamān al-Ḥimṣī from Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd Allah b. Abī Maryam from Aṭīyya b. Qays.
85. Dāwūd b. ‘Abd Allah from his father from his grandfather.
86. Hishām b. ‘Ammār from al-Walīd from al-Awzā‘ī.
87. Al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Amr and Aḥmad b. Muṣallih from shaykhs of Adharbayjān.

(ii) Abū Mikhnaḥ - code Abū Mikhnaḥ

1. 'Abbās b. Hishām from his father from 'Awāna b. al-Ḥakam and Abū Mikhnaḥ.
2. 'Umar b. Shabba from al-Madā'inī from Abū Mikhnaḥ from Mujālid from al-Sha'bī.
3. Wāqidī and Abū Mikhnaḥ (also under Wāqidī 15).
4. 'Abbās b. Hishām from his father from Abū Mikhnaḥ.
5. 'Umar b. Shabba from al-Madā'inī from Abū Ismā'īl al-Hamadhānī and Abū Mikhnaḥ from Mujālid b. Sa'īd from al-Sha'bī.
6. Hishām b. Muḥammad from Abū Mikhnaḥ from Farwa b. Laqīṭ al-Azadī.
7. Hishām b. al-Kalbī from Abū Mikhnaḥ and from Abū al-Khaṭṭāb Ḥamza b. 'Alī from a man of Bakr b. Wā'il.
8. Abū Mikhnaḥ alone.

(iii) Abū Ḥafs al-Dimashqī - code Abū Ḥafs

1. Abū Ḥafs from Muḥammad b. Rashīd from Maḥḥūl.
2. Abū Ḥafs from Sa'īd b. 'Abd al-'Azīz and Sa'īd b. Sulaymān al-Ḥimṣī.
3. Abū Ḥafs from his shaykhs.
4. Abū Ḥafs from Sa'īd b. 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Tanūkhī from a number of sources, among them Abū Bishr, Muḥdhin of Damascus Mosque.
5. Abū Ḥafs from Sa'īd b. 'Abd al-'Azīz.

6. Abū Ḥafṣ from Sa'īd b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, and also from Musà b. Ibrāhīm al-Tanūkhī from his father from shakhs of Ḥimṣ.
7. Abū Ḥafṣ from Sa'īd b. 'Abd al-'Azīz and also from Bāqiyya b. al-Walīd from shaykhs.

(iv) 'Amr al-Nāqid - code 'Amr

1. 'Amr al-Nāqid from al-Ḥajjāj b. Abī Manī' from his father from Maymun. b. Mihrān.
2. 'Amr al-Nāqid from 'Abd Allah b. Wahb al-Miṣrī from 'Umar b. Muḥammad from Nāfi' from Aslam.
3. 'Amr al-Nāqid from Abū Mu'āwiya from al-Shaybānī from al-Saffāḥ from Dāwūd b. Kurdūs.
4. 'Amr al-Nāqid from Abū Mu'āwiya from al-Shaybānī from Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Thaqafī.
5. Al-Ḥusayn and 'Amr al-Nāqid from Muḥammad b. Fuḍayl from al-A'mash from Ibrāhīm b. Muhājir from Musà b. Ṭalḥa.
6. 'Amr al-Nāqid from Ḥafṣ b. Ghayāth from 'Abd Allah b. Sa'īd from his grandfather.

(v) Bakr b. al-Haytham - code Bakr

1. BH from 'Abd Allah b. Ṣalīḥ from Musà b. 'Alī from his father.
2. BH from a shaykh of the people of al-Rayy.
3. BH from al-Nufayla 'Abd Allah b. Muḥammad Sulaymān b. 'Aṭā'.

4. BH from 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from Suhayl b. 'Uqayl from 'Abd Allah b. Hubayra.
5. BH from 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from Mu'āwiya b. Ṣāliḥ.
6. BH from 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from Mu'āwiya b. Ṣāliḥ from 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalḥa.
7. BH from Yahyā b. Ḍarīt, Qādi of al-Rayy.
8. BH and some of the people of Qazwīn from a shaykh of al-Rayy.

(vi) Muḥammad b. Ishāq - Code I.I.

1. Muḥammad b. Sa'd from al-Haytham b. Jamīl from Ḥammād b. Salma from I.I.
2. 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from I.I.
3. Ibn Ḥumayd from Salma from I.I. from Ṣāliḥ b. Kaysān.
4. Ibn Ishāq alone.
5. Ibn Ḥumayd from Salma from I.I.
6. Ibn Ḥumayd from Salma from I.I. from Ismā'īl b. Abī Khālīd, client of Bājila, from Qays b. Abī Ḥazim al-Bājali, who was at Qādisiyya.
7. Ibn Ḥumayd from Salma from I.I. from al-Qāsim b. Quzmān al-Miṣrī from Ziyād b. Jaz'al-Zubaydī, who was in the army of 'Amr b. al-'Ās.
8. Abū 'Ubayda Ma'mar b. Muḥanna and I.I.
9. I.I. from al-Zuhri.
10. As 2.

(vii) 'Abd Allah b. Lahī'a - Code B. Lahī'a.

1. 'Amr al-Nāqid from 'Abd Allah b. Wahb al-Miṣrī from IL from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb from 'Abd Allah b. al-Mughīra b. Abī Burda from Sufyān b. Wahb al-Khawlanī.
2. Al-Ḥusayn b. al-Aswad from Yaḥyā b. Ādam from Ibn al-Mubārak from IL from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb.
3. Ibrāhīm b. Muslim from 'Abd Allah b. al-Mubārak from IL from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb from Abū Firās from 'Abd Allah b. 'Amr b. al-'Ās.
4. Abū Ayyūb al-Raqqī from 'Abd al-Ghaffār al-Ḥarrānī from IL from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb from al-Jayshānī.
5. Abū 'Ubayd from 'Abd al-Ghaffār al-Ḥarrānī from IL from Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad from Ayyūb b. Abī al-'Aliyya from his father.
6. 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama from IL from Yaḥyā b. Maymūn.
7. Ibn Lahī'a alone.
8. 'Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ from IL from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb.
9. 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama from IL and Ibn Wahb from 'Amr b. al-Ḥārith from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb from 'Awf b. Hiṭṭān.
10. Yaḥyā b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr from IL from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb.
11. 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama from IL from Abū Qanān Ayyūb b. 'Alī al-'Aliyya from his father. Also 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama

from Ibn Wahb from Dāwūd b. 'Abd Allah al-Ḥaḍramī from
Abū Qanān from his father.

12. 'Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ from IL.
13. 'Alī b. Sahl from al-Walīd b. Muslim from IL from Yazīd
b. Abī Ḥabīb.
14. 'Abd al-Ḡhaffār b. Dāwūd al-Ḥarrānī from IL from Ibrāhīm
b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaḍramī from Ayyūb b. Abī al-'Aliyya from
his father.
15. 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from IL from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb.
16. 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama from IL from Yazīd b. 'Abd Allah
al-Ḥaḍramī.
17. Abū al-Aswad from IL from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb.
18. 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama from IL from Yazīd b. 'Abd Allah
al-Ḥaḍramī from Abū Qanān Ayyūb b. Abī al-'Aliyya from
his father.
19. Bakr b. al-Haytham from 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from IL from
Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb.

(viii) Al-Layth b. Sa'd - Code Al-Layth

1. Abū 'Ubayd from 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from al-Layth from
Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb.
2. Yaḥyà b. Khālīd from al-Layth.
3. 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from al-Layth from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb.
4. 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from al-Layth.

5. Hishām b. Ishāq from al-Layth from 'Abīd Allah b. Abī Ja'far.
6. Yahyā b. Bukayr from al-Layth from Kathīr b. Farqad and from Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ghanaḥ from Nāfi' from Aslam.
7. 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from al-Layth from Suhayl b. 'Uqayl from 'Abd Allah b. Hubayra al-Sabā'i.
8. Bakr b. al-Haytham from Abū Ṣāliḥ 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from al-Layth from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb.
9. Bakr b. al-Haytham from 'Abd Allah b. Ṣāliḥ from al-Layth from Yazīd b. Abī 'Ilāqa from 'Uqba b. 'Amir al-Juhanī.
10. Al-Layth from Ḥabīb b. Abī Thābit.
11. 'Amr al-Nāqid from 'Abd Allah b. Wahb from al-Layth from shaykhs.
12. 'Abd Allah b. Wahb from al-Layth from Mūsā b. 'Alī from his father.
13. 'Amr al-Nāqid from 'Abd Allah b. Wahb from al-Layth from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb.
14. 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama from al-Layth.

(ix) 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-Madā'ini - Code Madā'ini.

1. M from 'Abd Allah b. al-Qāsim from Farwa b. Laqīṭ.
2. M from his shaykhs.
3. Abū Zayd from M.

4. M from 'Ali b. Mujāhid from Ḥanbal b. Abū Ḥarīd - a Qāḍi of Qūhistān, from the marzubān of Qūhistān.
5. M and others.
6. 'Umar b. Shabba from M from Ali b. Mujāhid from Ḥanash b. Mālik.
7. 'Umar b. Shabba from M from Kulayb b. Khalaf and others.
8. M from various sources.
9. M from Abū Ḥafṣ al-Azadī from Idrīs b. Hanḡala al-'Ammi.
10. M from Zuhayr b. Hunayd.
11. M from Salma b. 'Uthmān from Ismā'īl b. Muslim from Ibn Sīrīn from his brother Qays from his father.
12. M from Zuhayr b. Hunayd from Iyās b. al-Muḡallib.
13. M from Maslama from Dāwūd.
14. M from Maslama from al-Sakān b. Qatada.

(x) Sayf b. 'Umar - Code Sayf.

N.B. These isnāds are usually prefaced by the phrase 'al Sarayy wrote to me about Shu'ayb from Sayf'. In the following list this has been omitted and the isnāds start with the name of Sayf's immediate informant.

1. 'Amr and al-Mujālid from al-Sha'bī.
2. Muḡammad from Abū 'Uthmān and Ṭalḡa from al-Muḡhīra.

3. Al-Ghusn b. al-Qāsim from a man of Banū Kināna and from Yunas b. Abī Ishāq.
4. Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allah from Abū 'Uthmān from Ibn Abī Muknif.
5. Muḥammad and Ṭalḥa and his companions.
6. 'Abd al-'Azīz (i.e. Ibn Sīāh) from Ḥabīb b. Abī Thābit.
7. Muḥammad b. Qays from al-Sha'bī.
8. Muḥammad and Ṭalḥa and also al-Muhallib and Ziyād.
9. Mubashshir and Sahl and Abū 'Uthmān from Khālīd and 'Ubāda and Abū Ḥaritha.
10. Abū 'Uthmān Yazīd b. Asīd al-Ghassānī from Khālīd and 'Ubāda.
11. As 10.
12. Abū 'Uthmān Yazīd b. Asīd al-Ghassānī and Abū Ḥaritha.
13. As 7.
14. Ṭalḥa and Sufyān from Māhan.
15. 'Amr b. Muḥammad from al-Sha'bī.
16. Abū Damra from 'Abd Allah b. al-Mustawrid from Muḥammad b. Sīrīn.
17. 'Abū 'Uthmān and Abū Ḥaritha from Khālīd and 'Ubāda.
18. Khālīd and 'Ubāda.
19. Muḥammad and Ṭalḥa and al-Muhallib.
20. Al-Miqdam b. Shurayḥ from his father.
21. Al-A'mash from Ḥabīb b. Suhbān Abī Mālik.
22. An unnamed informant from Abū 'Uthmān al-Nahdī.

23. Muḥammad and Ṭalḥa and al-Muḥallib and 'Amr and Sa'id.
24. As 23, but joined by Walīd b. 'Abd Allah b. Abī Ṭayba.
25. Muḥammad and Ṭalḥa and al-Muḥallib and 'Amr.
26. Muḥammad and Ṭalḥa and 'Amr and Abū 'Umar.
27. Muḥammad and Ṭalḥa and Abū 'Amr and Abū Sufyān.
28. Al-Rabī' Abu Sa'id and from Abū 'Uthmān and Abū Ḥaritha.
29. As 10.
30. Not used.
31. Abū Bakr al-Hudhalī.
32. Abū Ma'bad al-Absī and 'Urwa b. al-Walīd.
33. Muḥammad b. Sūqa from 'Āsim b. Kulayb from his father.
34. Abu Sufyān from al-Ḥasan.
35. Muḥammad and Ṭalḥa.
36. Al-Mubārak b. Faḍala from al-Ḥasan from Asayd b. al-Mutashammis b. Akhī al-Aḥnaf.

(xi) Muḥammad b. 'Umar al-Wāqidī - Code Wāqidī

1. W alone - or Muḥammad b. Sa'd from W.
2. Muḥammad b. Sa'd from W from 'Abd Allah b. 'Āmir with his isnād.
3. Muḥammad from W from Ma'mar from al-Zuhri.
4. Muḥammad b. Sa'd from W from 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Maslama from Furāt b. Salmān from Thābit b. al-Ḥajjāj.
5. Muḥammad b. Sa'd from W from Ishāq b. 'Abd Allah from Hayyān b. Shurayḥ.

6. Muḥammad b. Sa'd from W from Shuraḥbīl b. Abī 'Awn from 'Abd Allah b. Hubayra.
7. Muḥammad b. Sa'd from W from Maslama b. Sa'īd from Ishāq b. 'Abd Allah b. Abī Farwa.
8. Muḥammad b. Sa'd from W from Usāma b. Zayd b. Aslam from Nāfi', client of the family of al-Zubayr, from 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr.
9. Muḥammad b. Sa'd from W from al-Walīd b. Kathīr from Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb from Abū al-Ḥayr.
10. W from Usāma b. Zayd al-Laythī from Ibn Ka'b.
11. Al-Walīd b. Ṣāliḥ from W from Ibn Abī Sabra from Ṣāliḥ b. Kaysān from Sulaymān b. Yasār.
12. Muḥammad b. Sa'd from W from Thawr b. Yazīd from Rashīd b. Sa'd.
13. Al-Walīd b. Ṣāliḥ from W from 'Abd al-Ḥumayd b. Ja'far from Jarīr b. Yazīd b. Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah from his father from his grandfather.
14. Muḥammad b. Sa'd from W from Usāma b. Yazīd b. Aslam from his father from his grandfather.
15. Wāqidī and Abū Mikhnaḥ (also under Abū Mikhnaḥ 3).
16. Muḥammad b. Sa'd from W from Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allah from his uncle, al-Zuhrī, and others.

(xii) Yahyà b. Ādam - Code Yahyà.

1. Al-Ḥusayn from Y from Mandal from Abu Ishāq al-Shaybānī from Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Thaqafī.
2. Al-Ḥusayn b. al-Aswad from Y from Isrā'īl from Jābir from 'Āmir.
3. Al-Ḥusayn from Y from Sulb al-Zubaydī from Muḥammad b. Qays al-Asadī from al-Sha'bī.
4. Al-Ḥusayn from Y from Sharīk from Jābir from 'Āmir.
5. Al-Ḥusayn from Y from 'Abd al-Salām b. Ḥarb from Ma'mar 'Alī b. al-Ḥakam from Ibrāhīm al-Nakh'ī.
6. Al-Ḥusayn from Y.
7. Al-Ḥusayn from Y from Isrā'īl from Abū Ishāq from Ḥāritha b. Muḍarrib.
8. Al-Ḥusayn from Y from shaykhs of al-Jazīra from Sulaymān b. 'Aṭā' from Salma al-Juhānī from his uncle.
9. Al-Ḥusayn from Y from al-Ḥasan b. Ṣāliḥ from Ismā'īl b. Abī Khālīd.

Section III

APPRAISAL OF SOURCES

SELECTION, USE AND ASSESSMENT
OF THE SOURCE MATERIAL

In making any study which depends upon the examination of evidence, care must be taken to ensure that the source material used is a representative sample. To assemble all the evidence that might have a bearing on the subject is nearly always impossible, due to limitations of time, space, and availability of material, and this reservation applies to the present work, as to most others. The writer has limited his researches to those earlier works which are known to contain the great majority of the more reliable reports on the early Muslim conquests, omitting later compilations, works of marginal application to the subject, and those of notorious unreliability.

Over five hundred reports have been abstracted from the works studied and assembled in this thesis, and it is considered that these include the great majority of extant traditions on the Termination of Hostilities.

The reports were selected entirely by their applicability to the subject under study. They range from simple statements that a certain place was conquered, to the full texts of written treaties. Apart from the statements directly concerned with conquests and surrenders, a number of reports were added which have an immediate bearing on the subject, e.g. details of taxation, settlement of Arabs

in newly-conquered areas, posting of garrisons, etc. Having thus taken a large representative sample, closely prescribed in subject matter, the writer feels that the assessments and conclusions, carried out by both qualitative and quantitative methods, have genuine validity.

As described in Section I, the reports have been listed by regions, each list subdivided into categories. This listing is followed, for each region, by a commentary giving an outline narrative of the events, with an assessment of the situation and a criticism of the reports. To make the necessary evaluations several criteria were used. The first was the writer's own judgement, based upon an appreciation of the situation in each region, which was in turn derived from a consideration of the factors involved, close attention to the works of secondary authors, topographical and toponymical information, and knowledge of military affairs. The second criterion was a comparison between the reports, on the likelihood that a report that diverges significantly from the consensus is suspect. Finally, the provenance of individual reports was taken into account, if neither of the other criteria yielded positive results. This was done rarely, however, since it was considered preferable to establish the course of events, where possible, by examination and comparison of the evidence, rather than by argumentum ad hominem.

The regional section is followed by a final analysis of the reports as a whole, and by the Conclusion. The analysis of the reports attempts to illuminate certain features by the use of numerical and statistical methods, as well as by qualitative methods. In the Conclusion the results obtained from this analysis, and from the commentaries, are briefly summarised.

The sources present a different problem to the student of military affairs than to those concerned with legal, fiscal, sectarian, and theological matters (referred to hereafter as the 'Controversial subjects'). The former has to contend with ignorance and indifference, while the latter constantly encounter the insidious influence of bias. This is not to say, of course, that tendencies are absent from the traditions that deal with military affairs, although their influence is sporadic and incidental, rather than carefully structured. One must be constantly aware of the possible intrusion of tendencies, which usually manifest themselves in the form of statements which support the traditionists' opinions on the 'Controversial subjects'. Having no specialised knowledge of these, the writer is therefore grateful to those secondary authorities who have demonstrated how these tendencies can colour statements which are superficially free from bias. For example, the statement that amān was granted by a slave (South and Central Persia No. 94) is presumably connected with arguments about the legal competence of slaves, while anti-Umayyad tendencies may be contained

in the statement that Yazīd I increased taxation (Syria No. 54). The effect of bias is more pronounced, the closer the topic approaches the 'Controversial subjects'. It is hence more apparent in the reporting of treaty terms than in narratives which have a largely military content. Even so the incidence is random, and can usually be detected and isolated.

Furthermore, the effect of bias on the reporting of Terminations of Hostilities is usually peripheral, leaving the essential information intact.

The same may be said of another tendency, unconnected with the 'Controversial subjects', and that is the insertion of 'ayyām' type anecdotes into the narrative. One has in mind accounts of single combats,¹ the story of the dihqān who omitted his own name from the list of those to be granted amān,² and the tale of the widowed bride of Khālīd b. Sa'īd who fought the enemy with a tent-pole,³ etc. One can imagine these stories being circulated in many an evening majlis in Kūfa and Baṣra. Again, however, they add to the narrative without necessarily distorting it.

The ignorance and indifference of the authorities where military matters are concerned manifests itself in a number of ways.

¹North and Central Persia No. 79.

²Ibid., No. 81.

³B.118.

One is seldom told how towns were induced to surrender, although instances are given of the Muslims gaining admittance through the treachery of a citizen,¹ or by the use of ruses.² Very rarely is there any information about techniques of siege warfare, or the methods used to carry cities by assault. In pitched battles the size of the enemy forces is usually exaggerated to magnify the glory of Muslim victories, although the figures for Muslim armies can sometimes be accepted as authentic.³ Tactical information is nearly always meagre and confused. Chronology is often quite unreliable, although some authorities are considerably more dependable than others. A common error is to transfer the correct date for event A to event B, assigning the date of the battle of Ajnadayn to the battle of the Yarmūk, for instance.

All the authorities are unreliable on topographical matters, most of them seem to have been quite unconcerned with the location of the places which they mention. This, together with the confused chronology of many of the narratives, makes it very difficult at times to discover the true sequence of events.

The effect of this lack of attention to military affairs is that it acts as a levelling agent, overriding the tendencies of the various authorities in other matters. Because they are due to

¹ B. 380; T. 2554f.

² B. 134f.

³ Hill, 119-213; Beckmann, 47-53.

neglect, the errors have a random distribution - with certain exceptions they cannot be deduced from or attributed to a traditionist's known adherence to a particular school of opinion. Along with the faulty traditions a great deal of reliable information has survived, partly because it was in no one's interest to 'edit' it.

The raw material of the military historian of early Islam therefore consists of a mixture of sound and unsound traditions, and in the latter the unreliability is largely due to ignorance and honest confusion rather than to deliberate falsification. The effects of bias still intrude, of course, and these have been discussed during the course of this work as they occur. After allowing for the element of bias the author has found that the reports can be treated as a homogeneous body of roughly equivalent data. This leads logically to the conclusion that the conventional division of the authorities in categories having varying degrees of dependability is not valid in the field of military affairs, and it has been found that this is indeed the case. Setting aside a few reports from Abū Yūsuf, Sayf b. 'Umar, and others, when tendentiousness makes them suspect, a close examination has failed to detect any characteristics in any one authority that singles him out as more or less dependable than his congeners. In the schools of Medina, 'Irāq, and Egypt, and in the traditions of Wāqidi, Ibn Ishāq,

al-Madā'inī, Abū Mikhnaf, Ibn Lahī'a, al-Layth b. Sa'd, etc.

the ratio of sound to unsound is for practical purposes the same.

Nor can a specially high degree of unreliability be detected in the reports transmitted by 'family' isnāds.¹

There is, however, one class of report which provides an exception to this general rule, and that is the class which is derived from local sources. These frequently contain information which is absent from the traditions of the main schools, and they are usually somewhat more reliable and informative on points of topography and toponymy.

There can be no doubt that the most valuable work for the present study was the Futūh al-Buldān of Balādhurī. Because it is limited to military matters and allied subjects, a high proportion of the reports are relevant to the Termination of Hostilities, and two or more reports are often given for the same event. This historian's eclectic method has ensured the inclusion of traditions from all the major schools, together with a large number collected from local sources, many of which are found in no other compilations. Balādhurī sometimes gives his judgement as to the preferred report out of variant versions, but unfortunately he very seldom gives the reasons for his selections, and his opinions do not seem to be based on the 'probability-rating' of the several

¹Schacht, 147.

versions. It is usually best to ignore his judgements and rely on other criteria for estimating the relative value of different versions.

Many of Balādhurī's accounts are without isnāds, but this is not to be reckoned as a major disadvantage in view of the comments about the lack of distinguishing characteristics among the various authorities which have been made above.

A particularly valuable aspect of the 'Futūh is Balādhurī's attention to questions of land settlement and tenure - posting of garrisons, settlement of Arabs, the founding of the amṣār, granting of fiefs, and land-taxation. Some of this material has more relevance for a general work on the conquests, but much of it was of use for the present work.

The other work of this author, the monumental Ansāb al-Ashraf, was examined, but was found to contain little of application to the Termination of Hostilities. Much of the subject matter dealt with lies outside the period covered by this work, and the biographies that do fall inside the period are more concerned with political matters and personal anecdotes than with military affairs. Balādhurī himself evidently made a division of subject-matter between the two works, since he mentions the Futūh on a number of occasions and refers the reader to it for information about the conquests. Thus in his biography of Khālīd b. al-Walīd he says that 'his prowess in the conquests is described in the book of the Buldān', and gives

no further information about Khālīd's military achievements. A few reports from the Ansāb were nevertheless abstracted, but they add little to the information from the Futūh.

The Annals of Ṭabarī provided the second major source of material for this work. Although it is about twice as long as the Futūh for the same period, it covers a wider scope, and there are fewer reports on the Termination of Hostilities. Ṭabarī adheres closely to hadīth methods and has very few reports unsupported by isnāds. Most of his information comes from Sayf b. 'Umar, although he also gives a number of traditions from other authorities, notably al-Madā'inī, Abu Mikhnaf, Wāqidī, and Ibn Ishāq.

Sayf b. 'Umar has a poor reputation for reliability and this is not entirely unmerited. His main faults are an extremely confused chronology, and a tendency to exaggerate the prowess and exploits of the Kūfans at the expense of the Muslims from other areas. An example of this tendency is discussed below in the section on Mesopotamia, where a major role in the conquest is assigned to Kūfan forces, whereas the real conquerors of that province were Syrian troops under 'Iyāḍ b. Ghanm. Similar instances occur in his version of the conquest of Media, where the part played by Abū Mūsā and the Baṣrans is underestimated in order to show the Kūfans to the best advantage.

In a wider context, Sayf also shows bias towards 'Irāq as

opposed to Syria and Egypt. The conquests of the last two countries receive very brief and sketchy treatment, while the comparatively minor early campaigns in 'Irāq are narrated at great length. Skirmishes are magnified into battles, small battles into major engagements. The Persian conquests also receive thorough treatment, presumably because Kūfan troops were engaged in these campaigns. Because of this pre-disposition on the part of his principal authority Ṭabari is a major source only for the eastern part of the theatre of operations. For Syria and Egypt one must rely mainly on other sources.

As the analysis of the sources in Section V demonstrates, Sayf uses the term dhimma more than the other sources, and seems to have a certain tendency to adapt his reports to suit later legal principles. Another trait which has impaired his reputation is his manner of presenting military events - his very lengthy account of the battle of Qādisiyya, for instance, bears more resemblance to literary epic than to factual historical narrative.

When all these failings have been taken into account, however, there still remains a number of valuable accounts in Sayf's version that can be regarded as providing authentic information.. This is particularly true of some treaty texts, many of his reports about the conquest of Persia, and some details about taxation. It is felt that his reputation has suffered unduly at the hands of Caetani, who very rarely shows approval for any of his reports.

Caetani was especially interested in the chronology of early Islam, and Sayf's chronology is undoubtedly his most serious weakness. Caetani seems to have allowed his exasperation with Sayf's haphazard dating to overflow into a general and rather unfair condemnation of his whole output.

Al-Ya'qūbī does not usually give isnāds, but Petersen has classed his work as largely a digest of Abū Mikhnaḥ, with Hishām b. Muḥammad as intermediary. His other sources include Wāqidī, whom he occasionally mentions, Ibn Ishāq and al-Madā'inī. Both Petersen and Dūrī¹ ascribe pro-'Alid and anti-Umayyad tendencies to Ya'qūbī, and the former are indeed evident from his chapter headings, since only the reigns of 'Alī and his family are referred to as 'Caliphates', while the remainder are called the 'times' of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, etc. This seems to have had no discernible effect on his reporting of military events - his accounts of the campaigns of 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ and 'Abd Allah b. 'Āmir are fairly presented, without any noticeable bias.

Ya'qūbī's account of the conquests in the period under review is much briefer than those of Ṭabarī and Balādhurī, and reports on Terminations of Hostilities are fewer and shorter. His version is particularly valuable for his reports on Syria and Khurāsān. He is seldom completely unsound, and is conscientious about chronology.

¹Petersen, 169-171; Dūrī, 51-54.

The Futūh Miṣr of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam is a valuable work for a study of the conquests of Egypt and North Africa.¹ The largest part of his material came from the rāwī Ibn Lahī'a who has a poor reputation for reliability, and from the famous Egyptian authority al-Layth b. Sa'd. He also draws upon Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb and Yaḥyà b. 'Abd Allah b. Bukayr. In his chapters on the conquests he relies extensively on the renowned Egyptian authority 'Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ, who frequently appears as the transmitter of reports from the earlier traditionists. His name often appears at the beginning of paragraphs without isnāds, in much the same way as Balādhurī cites Waḡidī or Abū Mikhnaf as the guarantors of a known body of tradition.

Other authorities cited for the conquests include Yaḥyà b. Ayyūb, Khālīd b. Ḥumayd, and 'Abd al-Malik b. Maṣlama. 'Abd al-Malik had apparently made very extensive collections. His name often is the first in isnāds which contain the names of other authorities, such as Ibn Lahī'a, al-Layth b. Sa'd, Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb and others.

Balādhurī and 'Abū 'Ubayd also use Ibn Lahī'a and al-Layth b. Sa'd for their accounts of events in Egypt so that the history of the conquest is derived in significant part from these two authorities. There are, however, other reports from Balādhurī

¹See Torrey's introduction to Futūh Miṣr; Dūrī, 56-57; Brunschvig - passim.

without isnāds, from Wāqidī, Sayf b. 'Umar, Ya'qūbī and John of Nikiou, so the evidence is by no means completely unbalanced. In any case, the versions of these two traditionists, and others cited by Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, is not abnormally unreliable on military affairs, a subject less open than some others to the exercise of tendentious pleading.

The Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl of al-Dīnawarī was not found to be of much value for the study of the conquests. There are few relevant reports and those that do occur are brief, and add little to the versions of the major sources. Dīnawarī's interest seems to have confined almost exclusively to 'Irāq and Persia - there is hardly a mention worthy of note for the other theatres of operations.

The Futūḥ al-Buldān of Ibn A'tham al-Kūfī proved a disappointment for information about the period under review.¹ The work begins with the Caliphate of 'Uthmān but gives no details of the conquests achieved in 'Uthmān's time. In the section of the manuscript which deals with this period (pp. 1-42) he starts by listing the governors who were installed or confirmed in power by 'Uthmān, says that 'they made the conquests', and then devotes the rest of his narrative to describing the dissensions which led up to the death of 'Uthmān. His history then goes on to give a valuable account of the struggle between 'Alī and his opponents

¹E.I., 'Ibn Atham al-Kufi', 723.

but does not take up the story of the conquests until after Mu'āwiyah's assumption of the Caliphate.

The Kitāb al-Amwāl of Abū 'Ubayd, together with the reports from this authority which are cited by Balādhurī, constitute a source of the highest worth for the study of the Arab conquests. Most of his reports refer to the settlements in Egypt, Syria, and 'Irāq - he seems to have been little interested in conditions in the other provinces. His reports are concerned rather more with the legal aspects of the settlements than with the military, but nevertheless there are many reports which are of direct relevance to the Termination of Hostilities. Abū 'Ubayd draws upon the same authorities as other historians and traditionists, notably al-Layth b. Sa'd, Ibn Lahī'a, al-Sha'bī, and al-Awzā'i. Of greater value even than his transmission of such data, however, is his readiness to add his own comments in explanation and expansion of the reports which he is quoting. These comments give a sober, considered assessment of the information in the traditions, not merely an opinion of the 'soundness' of the reports from the viewpoint of the hadīth rules. Of this nature are his comments on the sulh/ʿanwatan controversy in Egypt (No. 17), on the conquest of the land in Syria (No. 94), and on the taxation of fruit crops in 'Irāq (No. 14).

Furthermore, in the traditions transmitted by Abū 'Ubayd there

is a high incidence of valuable and reliable information. Particularly useful are the reports on taxation and provisioning in Egypt and Syria (Egypt No. 16, Syria No. 86) and the description of the collection of the poll-tax in 'Irāq through the agency of the dihgāns (No. 18). Although Report No. 19 for 'Irāq contains an element of legal rationalisation, in the statement that jizya was not taken from free people, it nevertheless gives a convincing picture of the way in which the Sawād was occupied and the subsequent treatment of the inhabitants.

Despite its early date, the Kitāb al-Kharāj of Abū Yūsuf is less valuable than the work of Abū 'Ubayd. Abū Yūsuf's view is narrower and his reports are sometimes marred by the intrusion of jurisprudential tendencies, as the writer has occasion to point out several times during the course of this work. Abū Yūsuf's interests apparently lay mainly in 'Irāq - the preponderance of his information refers to the settlement of the Sawād - together with some concern with Syria and Mesopotamia. He pays little attention to conditions in Egypt or Persia. A large number of his reports carry the name of Ibn Ishāq, which suggests that he found the opinions of this authority congenial. His reports on 'Irāq and Syria add little to the information in the historians, and several of them are affected by the fiqh tendencies referred to above. There is, however, a long and valuable narrative on conditions in Mesopotamia (pp. 22-25, Reports Nos. 10, 14), which

was transmitted to Abū Yūsuf by an unnamed shaykh of Hīra. This contains information about the situation in the province before the conquests, and an account of the negotiations which led to the surrender of Rūhā.

The Kitāb al-Kharāj of Qudāma b. Ja'far was read only in the abridged English version of A. Ben Shemesh. Qudāma's main source is the Kitāb al-Amwāl of Abū 'Ubayd, and indeed the similarity between the two works is very noticeable.¹ Very little of value, additional to the major sources, was found in this work.

Of the five local histories in Persian which were consulted, two - Muḥasin Isfahān and History of Tabaristān - were discovered to possess little of direct bearing on the Termination of Hostilities. Of the others, the anonymous Tārīkh-i-Sīstān contains a valuable account of the early expeditions to this province. This largely confirms Balādhurī's version, but adds details about events leading to the surrender of the city of Zaranj, and about the beginnings of the traffic in slaves from Central Asia. (South and Central Persia Nos. 44, 72.)

In the Tārīkh Nīshābūr of al-Ḥakim al-Nīsābūrī there is an account of the negotiations between the Persian ruler and the Muslims about taxation in Nīshāpūr. This gives a clear indication that much of the substance of power remained with the Persian

¹ Ben Shemesh, 7.

leaders, and confirms the reports in the Arabic sources on the methods of collection of revenue.

The information given in Tārīkh-i-Qumm included reports on the conquests of Tustar and Sūs which are very similar to those in Balādhurī and Dīnawarī, in this case the informant being given as Ibn Ishāq. The accounts of the conquests of Qumm, Qāshān, and Isfahān virtually repeat the version of Balādhurī.

Two Christian sources were consulted. Michael the Syrian provides some useful information on Syria and Mesopotamia, but his one report on Egypt (No. 39) is completely unreliable. In his report on Jerusalem (No. 2) he supports Sayf b. 'Umar's statement that no Jew was to be allowed in that city. He also endorses statements in the Arabic sources that Damascus and other Syrian cities surrendered voluntarily after the battle of the Yarmūk (No. 10). Perhaps the most interesting report from this historian is his account of the beginning of the campaign in Mesopotamia (No. 8). He gives the Arab leader as 'Iyād b. Ghannm and the date of the invasion as A.H. 18, and says that the reason for the invasion was that the Greeks had not paid the promised tribute. The value of the chronicle, however, lies not so much in the detailed information which it contains, as in the attitude of continuing hatred of the Jacobites for the Orthodox which it reveals - and this author was writing five centuries after the Muslim conquest.

John of Nikiou wrote his chronicle at the end of the 7th century A.D. and he was thus almost a contemporary of the events which he describes. His account of the conquest of Egypt is invaluable, and his version, despite its lacunae and confused chronology, acts as a datum for checking the Arabic sources for certain events. His version of the treaty terms for Alexandria is almost certainly authentic (No. 40).

Turning to the secondary authorities, a distinction must be made between those which deal with the conquests, or part of them, in a general manner, and those concerned with specialised fields.

Of the former, the Annali dell'Islam of Leone Caetani are without doubt of the first importance, providing not only a translation of much of the source material, but also a careful and acute analysis of the traditional material. A considerable debt is due to him for his careful reconstruction of the chronology of the conquests, which remains the most reliable guide to the course of events. In general the author has felt himself able to concur with Caetani in many of his judgements, notable exceptions being his total condemnation of Sayf b. Umar, and his assertion that the source material was refashioned into a stereotyped mould to make the facts conform to later theories and usages.

There are several works which deal with selected regions: Butler for Egypt, De Goeje for Syria, Gibb for Central Asia, and

Bosworth for Sīstān. These all have their value in assisting towards an appreciation of the conditions in the countries considered, although Gibb and Bosworth give only brief details for the early expeditions. Butler is useful for the Egyptian campaign, particularly for toponymical information, but Caetani has developed a more convincing narrative for certain of the main episodes. De Goeje's work was also subjected to criticism by Caetani, but on the whole his conclusions retain their validity.

The only general work on the military aspect of the early conquests is The Great Arab Conquests by J.B.Glubb, which provides some information on tactics and movements derived from the author's own military experiences in the Middle East. The work is without references, however, and his treatment of the campaigns is too brief to be of much value for detailed study.

As far as the specialised works are concerned, where the subject has touched directly on military affairs the author has referred to the dissertation of Leo Beckmann and to his own unpublished work. Since both of these treatises drew upon the secondary authorities in this subject, as well as upon primary sources, it was felt that they sufficed for information in this field.

The Majmū'at al-Wathā'iq of Muḥammad Ḥamīdullah is concerned in part with the Termination of Hostilities. Since this work was not intended as a critical study of sources, but rather, as its

name implies, as a collection of treaty texts and other documents, it was not found to be of great value for the present work. The texts of the major treaties are given, but not events leading up to surrenders, nor the reports of conquests where no treaties were concluded.

The geographical studies of Fisher and Le Strange are not cited but were nevertheless invaluable for an appreciation of topography, toponymy, climate, and terrain.

Petersen's work, although it deals with a somewhat later period - the 'Alī/Mu'āwiya conflict - was very useful for its assessment of the genesis and development of the traditional sources. Of particular interest is Petersen's description of the growth of the corpus of basic material in 'Irāq and Medina, and the adaptations of that material in the first three Hijra centuries to bring it into conformity with the moving stress of sectarian opinion. As the author of the present work has indicated, it is ignorance rather than bias that affects the sources in their handling of military matters, but Petersen's treatise was nevertheless of considerable value on many points.

Dūrī's study of the sources is useful in that it assembles under one cover the biographical data about the principal authorities. Being largely non-critical, however, it gives little insight into the tendencies which affected their transmission of information.

The other works consulted are concerned largely with jurisprudence

and allied subjects. Khadduri's War and Peace in the Law of Islam deals mainly with the theory and practice of the legal code after it was canonically established by the Schools. Hence it was chiefly of use in defining the standards of reference to which the traditionists might have been aspiring when they were disposed to 'adapt' their material.

Brunschvig has taken the view that Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam and his informants in effect falsified the early history of the conquests of Egypt and North Africa to make it conform to Malikite principles, and Schacht has supported this viewpoint, extending the devaluation to other Muslim authorities. Even if these strictures were entirely valid, the author feels, for reasons given elsewhere in this work, that they could not be applied with the same rigour to military affairs. It is considered, moreover, that this absolute condemnation cannot be justified on the evidence, even in the field of jurisprudence. The brief quantitative analysis of source material at the end of this work suggests that the incidence of tendentiousness was much more sporadic than these authors and others have postulated.

A more tolerant view is presented by Dennett in his Conversion and the Poll-tax in Early Islam which seems to approach closest to the actual state of affairs in fiscal administration. His basic hypothesis, that the reports are by no means stereotyped, but

demonstrate an honest confusion in the face of the diversity of conditions in the different regions, in general accords well with the evidence presented by the sources.

Section IV

REPORTS AND COMMENTARIES BY REGIONS

A. Egypt and Nubia

LIST OF REPORTS

(i) For the whole country

Type A1

1. 'When we conquered Egypt without 'ahd al-Zubayr urged 'Umar to divide it as Muḥammad divided Khaybar. 'Umar refused: "leave it so that the descendants of the descendants may profit from it".' B.214 (B.lahī'a 1).
2. Abū 'Ubayd says: 'The Copts of Miṣr were like Ahl al-Sawād - their story is similar. The Greeks ruled over them as the Persians ruled over Ahl al-Sawād, and they had no power or strength. When the Greeks were driven out from power over them they fell into the hands of the Muslims. Because of this the traditionists disagree about them; some say it was taken 'anwatan, others that ṣulḥ was made for them by the Greeks with the Muslims. About all of that there are many traditions.' AU. 140.
3. 'Amr said: 'The Copts have no 'ahd, I can kill them if I wish, enslave them if I wish, take the "fifth" if I wish'. FM. 89 (B. Lahī'a 7).
4. The same report is given in Abū 'Ubayd, as in 3. above. AU. 140 (B. Lahī'a 15). Other reports, supporting the 'anwatan version in Abū 'Ubayd 140-141.

5. 'Amr said: 'No Copt has 'aqd or 'ahd except the people of Anṭābulus'. FM. 89 (B. Lahī'a 11).
6. The same report as in 3. and 4. above. B.217 (B. Lahī'a 5).
7. Egypt was taken 'anwatan, without 'aqd or 'ahd.
FM. 88 f (U. 50).

3.

Type A2

8. Dhimma

'Some of Egypt was conquered by 'ahd, and some was 'anwatan;
'Umar made it all dhimma and that has lasted to this day.'
FM. 83 (U. 51).

9. Dhimma

Some prisoners from Egyptian villages were sent to Medina,
but 'Umar returned them to their homes, as he considered
the Copts as dhimma people. FM. 83 (Al-Layth 3).

Type A6

10. Amān; Jizya; Kharāj; Payments in kind; Sharṭ; Written
(This is rather a confusing report, as it begins with a
story about the fall of the town of Miṣr, and then goes on
to deal with the country. It is quite evident from the
wording that the country is Miṣr is being discussed.)
The chief of Miṣr asked 'Amr to treat them as the Jews and

Christians of Syria were treated, leaving the land with its owners, paying its kharāj, which would do more good than killing them. So he assessed on them (after consulting the Muslims, most of whom agreed) as jizya two dinars on every adult, except the poor, and in addition, on every landowner three irdabbs of wheat, two qists of oil, two qists of honey, and two qists of vinegar, to be given as subsistence allowance to the Muslims. A census was taken of the Muslims, and the inhabitants of Miṣr were required to provide every Muslim with a woollen upper gown, an upper cloak or turban, breeches and a pair of shoes. To this end a statement was written, in which it was stipulated (sharṭ) that as long as they kept these terms, their women and children would not be sold or taken captive, and their possessions and treasures would be left in their hands. This statement was submitted to 'Umar, who endorsed it. Thus the whole land became kharāj land. Because, however, 'Amr signed the sharṭ and the kitāb, some thought that Miṣr was taken sulhan. B.214 f (B. Lahī'a 3).

Type B2

11. 'Ahd; Sulh (assumed)

The 'ahd for the people of Egypt was made with their chiefs.
FM 85 (U. 49).

Type B312. 'Ahd; Tax; Sulh.

'The people of Egypt were conquered by 'Amr by sulh, 'ahd, and something assessed on them.' B. 217 f (Wāqidī 13).

Type B413. Kharāj; Sulh

'In the year 20 'Amr, accompanied by al-Zubayr, subdued Egypt, and he made terms with the people of the country for something which he imposed on them, namely two dinars on every man, excluding women and boys. The kharāj during his governorship reached two million dinars, but later it reached four million.' B. 218 (Wāqidī 14).

Type B514. Jizya; Sulh (assumed)

A jizya of two dinars was imposed on every adult, not including women and boys; the number paying this tax was eight million. FM 70 (B. Lahī'a 6; Al-Layth 3).

15. Jizya; Sulh

All Egypt was sulh except Alexandira; the jizya was not to exceed two dinars per head, except for what was added for landowners.

16. Jizya; Provisioning; Sulh (assumed)

(This report covers conditions in Syria and Egypt; it mentions jizya, and then goes on to describe the different methods for provisioning the Muslims in the two regions.)

'From the people of Egypt 'Umar took an irdabb [of wheat?] for every Muslim each month, and I do not know what amount of fat and honey.' AU 40 (Al-Layth 6).

17. Jizya; Provisioning; Shart; 'Ahd; Written; Sulh

A shaykh was asked 'did the people of Egypt have an 'ahd?'. He answered 'yes'. Then he was asked 'did they have written statements?'. He said 'yes' - and named some. He gave the conditions (shurūṭ) of the 'ahd as follows: not to evict them from their homes; not to take away their wives, or their children, or their treasure, or their land; not to increase (the tax) on them.

Abū 'Ubayd comments: 'The reports differ about the Egyptians, but I saw that there were two events, and that both reports are right. Egypt was conquered twice, the first time sulḥan, the second time, after the Greeks had violated the treaty, 'anwatan. There are other reports which confirm this.' AU 141 f (Al-Layth 3).

Type C4

18. Sulh; Amān; Kharāj

The king of Alyūna made terms for himself and for the people

of his city; then, with their agreement, he made the same sulh for all the people of Egypt. Kharāj was assessed on the land of Egypt to the amount of one dinar and three irdabbs of wheat on every jarīb, and two dinars on every adult. B. 215.

19. Sulh; Amān; Kharāj; 'Ahd; Written.

'The people of Egypt had an 'ahd and an 'agd. 'Umar wrote them a statement to the effect that they had amān for their lives, possessions, women, and children, and that none of them would be sold as slaves. He imposed on them a kharāj, which was not to be increased, and promised to expel all fear of an attack by an enemy.' 'Uqba added 'I was a witness to that'. B. 218 (Al-Layth 9).

Type C5

20. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; Shart; 'Ahd.

The shurūt were: security for themselves, their wives, and their children; no increase in taxation; they were to be defended from their enemies. FM 85 f (B. Lahī'a 10).

21. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; Provisioning; Shart; 'Ahd; Written.

The people of Egypt had an 'ahd, and three of the treaties were in writing. The jizya was two dinars on every man, and they also had to provide rations for the Muslims. They were

given security for their houses, villages, women, and land, and their taxes were not to be increased.

FM 85 (Al-Layth 5).

22. Sulḥ; Amān; Dhimma; Jizya; Sharṭ; 'Ahd; Written.

This report says that 'Amr wrote a treaty for the people of Egypt after the fall of 'Ayn Shams. The Muslims would fulfil its terms only if the people paid the jizya. The amān was for their lives, possessions, crosses, and churches, which were not to be damaged or occupied. There was to be a land-tax assessed according to the flow of the Nile flood. Greeks and Nubians could leave under safe-conduct if they wished, but those who remained would be bound by the treaty. T. 2587 ff (Sayf 28).

23. Sulḥ; Amān; Dhimma; Jizya; Sharṭ; 'Ahd; Billeting.

This is a long passage which deals with the negotiations between 'Amr and Muqawqis at Babylon. 'Amr sent a delegation to Muqawqis under the leadership of 'Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit, a negro. He offered the standard 'three choices': acceptance of Islam; or submission on condition of paying the jizya; or war. If he chose the second, they would keep possession of some of their land, have security for their lives and possessions, and be given protection against their enemies. If they fulfilled their dhimma the Muslims would carry out their obligations, and there would be an 'ahd between them.

After trying to buy the Muslims off with an offer of two dinars to every Muslim, one hundred to 'Amr and one thousand to 'Umar, Muqawqis agreed to the second alternative. He failed to persuade his companions to accept this and hostilities were renewed. Finally, however, they agreed to sulh and to pay the jizya. 'Amr consulted his companions, who wished to refuse sulh and jizya, and to conquer the land, so that it became fay' and ghanima in the same way as the fortress (Babylon) had become. But 'Amr said that 'Umar had commanded him to accept one of the three choices. So the sulh was made for all the Copts in Egypt, regardless of class, on payment of two dinars on every adult. They were required to entertain one or more Muslims for three days; their lands and possessions were not to be interfered with. The terms (shart) applied to the Coptic community in particular. FM 64-70 (Yahyà b. Ayyūb and Khālīd b. Humayd.

And also from 'Uthmān b. Sālīh).

(ii) Alexandria

Type A1

24. 'Amr wrote to 'Umar: "Allah has given us Alexandria 'anwatan without 'aqd or 'ahd." B. 216.
25. Alexandria was besieged for five months before the death of Heraclius and for nine months after his death. The conquest

was on a Friday, at the beginning of Muḥarram, in year 20.

FM 80 (B. Lahī'a 6).

26. 'Al-Muqawqis, who was over Egypt, was the person who made the sulḥ with 'Amr, for the payment of two dinars for every Copt. When Heraclius, ruler of the Greeks, heard of this he was enraged, and sent troops, who put Alexandria into a state of siege, and declared war on 'Amr. He fought against them, and wrote to 'Umar: "we have conquered Alexandria, 'anwatan, gasran, without 'ahd, or 'aqd." AU 142 (Al-Layth 3).
27. 'In the year 25 Manuḥil came to Alexandria, killed the garrison, and took over the city. His troops went raiding in Lower Egypt, whence they were driven back into the city. 'Amr captured it 'anwatan, killing Manuḥil and the fighting men, and taking the children captive. He razed the city walls. Some of the Greeks left to join their compatriots in another place.' B. 221.
28. Alexandria rebelled and was reduced by 'Amr. The children were taken prisoner and sent to Medina, but were returned to their homes by 'Uthmān. Y. 189.
29. Alexandria rebelled and the Muslim garrison were killed. 'Amr returned and reconquered it 'anwatan without 'aqd or 'ahd. FM 80 (Al-Layth 4).
30. Referring to 29. above, it is stated that this is the second conquest. FM 80 (B. Lahī'a 7).

31. After they had rebelled, 'Amr reduced Alexandria with some killing. T. 2809 (Wāqidī 1).
32. 'Amr conquered Alexandria the second time 'anwatan in the Caliphate of 'Uthmān, after the death of 'Umar. B. 223 (Al-Layth 12).
33. 'Some reports give year 23 for the invasion of Alexandria, others say year 25.' B. 221 f.

Type A2

34. Dhimma

Al-Muqawqis tried to get the inhabitants of Alexandria to surrender without fighting, but they refused. After a siege lasting three months 'Amr took the city by the sword. This was in year 21. 'He took booty and sent the "fifth" to 'Umar but he did not kill or take captives. He reduced them to dhimmis like those of Alyūna.' B. 220 f.

Type A6

35. Jizya; Kharāj.

'Amr imposed kharāj on the land of Alexandria, and jizya on its people.' (Referring to the second conquest.) B. 221 f.

36. Jizya; Kharāj;

Jizya and kharāj were imposed on Alexandria as seen fit. They

had no sulh, no 'aqd or 'ahd, no dhimma. It was taken
'anwatan. FM 82 f (U. 47).

Type B1

37. Sulh.

According to Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb, Alexandria was sulhan.
B. 216 (U 31).

38. Sulh.

'Not one town in al-Maghrib was taken sulhan except Alexandria,
Kafarṭīs, and Sulṭays.' B. 222 (Wāqidī 5).

Type B2

39. Surrender; other terms.

'In Egypt, we have found from our histories, that Benjamin,
Patriarch of the Orthodox [i.e. the Jacobites] had delivered
Egypt to the Arabs. Because they had been oppressed by the
persecution of the Chalcedonians the Egyptians surrendered
Alexandria and Misrin to the Arabs. Cyrus, Chalcedonian
Patriarch, expelled Benjamin, who went to the Arabs, and
promised to surrender Alexandria to them if they would evict
Cyrus and give him the churches. With solemn oaths they
promised to do this. Cyrus collected all the church treasure
and left secretly for Constantinople.' MS 432 f.

Type B340. Surrender; tribute; other terms.

'After the death of Heraclius and of his son Constantine, another son Heraclius, by another mother Martine, took the throne. He sent Cyrus back to Egypt with full powers to conclude a treaty of peace with the Muslims. The general of the army, Constantine, went with him.

On his arrival at Alexandria Cyrus received a great welcome from the people. He was not the only one to desire peace; the people, the Governors, the Domentianus, who was in favour with the Empress Martine, met together and deliberated with Cyrus about making peace with the Muslims.

Cyrus went to Babylon to ask for peace from the Muslims, offering to pay tribute. 'Amr received him with kindness and accepted the offer. The terms were as follows:

- (i) Payment of tribute.
- (ii) A pause for eleven months, during which the Muslims were to remain isolated and not to interfere.
- (iii) The Greek soldiers at Alexandria were to embark carrying their possessions and precious goods.
- (iv) No Greek army was to return.
- (v) The Muslims would take hostages - 150 military and 50 civilians.

(vi) The Muslims would not seize churches or interfere with Christians.

(vii) Jews would be allowed to live at Alexandria.

JN 453-455.

41. Sulh; Tax; Other terms; Written.

'Some say that Al-Muqawqis made the sulh with 'Amr on condition that he paid 13,000 dinars and that two dinars was levied on every adult Copt. People were to have the choice between leaving or staying. 'Amr wrote a statement to this effect and returned to Al-Fusṭāṭ, leaving a governor with a garrison (rābiṭa).' B. 221.

Type B4

42. Sulh; Kharāj; Other terms.

The sulh for Alexandria was two dinars kharāj on every man, and that those who wished to return to Byzantium could do so. Y. 170.

(iii) Towns and Villages of Egypt 639/18 - 641/20

Type A1

43. The Fayyūm was conquered by a lieutenant of 'Amr. No details. FM 169 (U. 52).

44. 'The Muslims advanced to Nikiou, where they found no troops. They took possession of the town, massacring men, women and

children, and sparing no one.' JN 448.

45. 'Amr came to Bilbays which held out for nearly a month before it was reduced. FM 59 (U. 45).

Type A2

46. 'Ahd.

Umm Dunayn, Balhīb and other towns of Egypt had 'ahd.

'Umar said that they were to be asked to accept Islam.

If they did not accept they were to be returned to their towns. FM 83 f (B. Lahī'a 9).

47. Dhimma; 'Ahd.

The towns of Bilhīt, Sulṭays, and Al-Khays resisted 'Amr's advance and he took away some of their inhabitants and sent them to Medina. 'Umar sent them back and made them and the Coptic community dhimma. They had an 'ahd which they did not break. B. 215 f.

Type A4

48. Kharāj

The towns of Balhīb (Bilhīt ?), Sulṭays, and Maṣīl were occupied by the Greeks when they re-occupied Alexandria.

When the Muslims recaptured Alexandria they wished to consider these towns as fay', like Alexandria, but 'Uthmān refused and said that they were to be kharāj lands.

FM 83 (U. 48).

Type A6

49. Dhimma; Jizya; Kharāj.

(This report refers to the town of Miṣr, also called Fuṣṭāṭ in the text.)

The Muslims took the fort 'anwatan, and considered it legal to take what was in it. 'Amr made its people dhimma and put the jizya on their necks and the kharaj on their lands. He wrote to 'Umar who endorsed his action. B.213.

Type B2

50. Surrender; Other terms.

'Amr besieged the garrison in the citadel of Babylon.

They surrendered on the promise of their lives, but had to leave behind all war material, of which there was a considerable amount. They left, taking with them a small quantity of gold, on the eve of the Feast of the Resurrection.'

JN. 446 f.

Type B3

51. Sulh; Tax.

Al-Muqawqis made terms (sulh) with 'Amr for Umm Dunayn, on condition that two dinars was imposed on every man.'

Y. 169.

52. Sulh; Payments in kind.

'Amr required the people (of Umm Dunayn?) to provide every Muslim with one dinar, one burnus, one jubba, one turban and one pair of shoes. The local people then prepared a meal for the Muslims. FM 60 (U. 44).

53. Sulh; Tax.

Al-Muqawqis made the sulh with 'Amr for Babylon, agreeing to pay two dinars tax for every man. FM 62 (U. 45).

(iv) Nubia

Type A1

54. 'Uqba b. Nāfi' was sent against Nubia by 'Amr. There was fierce fighting but no conquest was made. Y. 179.

Type B3

55. Treaty (Hudna); Tribute; Sharṭ; 'Ahd; Written; Other terms.

The 'ahd was in writing: they had to hand over 360 slaves each year, and were obliged to return runaway slaves and dhimma people; either side could pass through the other's territory but could not settle there; the hudna was void if they killed or enslaved Muslims. FM 189.

56. Sulh; Tribute; Other terms.

'Amr went to Nubia and after a sharp fight a treaty was made. They agreed to pay a tribute of slaves and mounts, not to raid,

and not to forbid trade, either import or export.

T. 2589 (Sayf 28).

57. Treaty (Hudna); Barter.

'There is no 'ahd or mīthāq between the people of Egypt and the people of Al-Asāwid (Nubia), but there is a hudna between us. They give us slaves and we give them some corn and lentils.' AU 146 (B. Lahī'a 15).

58. Sulh; Barter.

'The sulh was on condition that we did not make war on them and that they did not make war on us. They give us slaves and we give them food.' AU 146 (Al-Layth 4).

59. Sulh; Barter.

The people of Nubia made a sulh with 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abī Sarḥ, on condition that they gave a gift of slaves in return for a gift of food and clothing. T. 2593 (Sayf 30).

60. Sulh; Barter.

The sulh with Nubia stipulated that they give annually 300 slaves in return for a like value in food and drink. Y. 191.

61. Sulh; Hudna; Barter.

Hostilities with Nubia continued until 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abī Sarḥ ruled Egypt. Then they asked 'Abd Allah for sulh and muwā'ida. There was no jizya - it was a treaty (hudna). They were to offer 300 slaves every year in return for a like value in food. B. 236 f (Wāqidi 9).

(v) Other reports on Egypt

62. Mu'āwiyā wrote to Wardān, a freedman of 'Umar, to increase the tax on every Copt by one qirāt. Wardān wrote back 'how can I increase it when it is in their 'ahd that it cannot be increased?'. B. 217 (U. 10).
63. 'The people of the jizya in Egypt made new terms after the first sulh. They agreed, in the Caliphate of 'Umar, that instead of the wheat, oil, and vinegar which they gave, they would pay two dinars in addition to the two dinars. Each man was thus bound to pay four dinars.' B. 216 (Al-Layth 8).
64. 'Umar wrote to his governors saying that their men were assured of their stipends, and provision for their families; they were not to engage in agriculture. FM 162 (U. 8).
65. When 'Amr was advancing to Alexandria, the Copts assisted him by repairing the roads, building bridges, and opening markets. FM 73 (U. 45).
66. The jizya in Alexandria was 18,000 dinars, but amounted to 36,000 in the time of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik. B. 223 (Bakr 1).
67. 'Umar wrote to his governors about the jizya:
'Their jizya is forty dirhams on those who have silver, and four dinars on those with gold. [There follows a sentence on provisioning in Syria.] As for Egypt they have to provide

an irdabb of wheat every month for every Muslim. They must provide cloth and clothing out of which the Amīr al-Mu'minīn will clothe the Muslims. Also they must entertain Muslim travellers for one night. The jizya was not imposed on women or boys; it was sealed on the necks of the people of the jizya.' FM 151 f (U. 18).

68. 'When 'Amr had reduced Fustāṭ, he sent to 'Ayn Shams 'Abd Allah b. Ḥudhāfa al-Sahmi, who took possession of its land and made terms ḥulh with the people of its villages on similar terms to Fustāṭ. Likewise 'Amr sent Khārija b. Ḥudhāfa al-'Adawī to al-Fayyūm, al-Ushmunayn, Ikhmīm, al-Basharūdāt and the villages of Upper Egypt, where he did the same. 'Amr also sent 'Umayr b. Wahb al-Jumāhī to Tinnīs, Dimyāt, Tūna, Damīra, Shaṭā, Diqala, Banā, Būṣīr, with the same result. And he sent 'Uqba b. 'Amīr al-Juhani to the remainder of the villages in the lower part of the country, where he did the same. Thus did 'Amr conquer all Egypt and its land became kharāj land.' B. 216 f (B. Lahī'a 4).

COMMENTARY

(a) Brief survey of the conquest

'Amr b. al-'ās, at the head of some 4,000 warriors, reached the borders of Egypt at al-'Arīsh on 12th December 639, 10 Dhu al-Hijja A.H. 18.¹ From there he took the inland route to Pelusium, al-Faramā' in Arabic, and captured the town after a siege lasting for about one month. His route then lay via the modern al-Qanṭara to Bilbays, where again the town held out for a month before it was taken.² After its fall the Arab army advanced to Umm Dunayn, near the great fortress of Babylon, at the head of the Delta.³ Learning that a strong Greek army was advancing towards Babylon, and being doubtless aware of the formidable difficulty of reducing a fortress such as Babylon, 'Amr now urgently requested reinforcements from Medina.⁴ While waiting for these reinforcements he mounted a swift raid to the Fayyūm.⁵ Al-Zubayr with 4,000 men with two parties of similar strength following arrived at Heliopolis, 'Ayn al-Shams in Arabic, in June 640, Jumādā II, A.H. 19, and a junction was affected with 'Amr on his return from the Fayyūm. The opposing armies met in battle in July 640, Rajab A.H. 19, and the

¹FM 58.

²FM 59.

³B. 213 f.

⁴FM 59.

⁵JN 439.

result was a complete victory for the Arabs.¹ The whole region was now at the mercy of the Arabs: Miṣr, Umm Dunayn and other towns at the apex of the Delta were occupied, and the siege of Babylon began in earnest in September 640, Ramaḍān A.H. 19. The siege lasted for seven months, fighting being confined to sallies, and to skirmishes outside the walls. The surrender, although it may have been precipitated by an abortive assault led by al-Zubayr, probably came because the garrison despaired of being relieved and were disheartened by the news of the death of Heraclius. On Easter Monday, 9th April 641, 21 Rabi' II A.H. 20, they evacuated the fortress, leaving behind all treasure and war material.² The way was now open to Alexandria, and the army was set in motion along the western bank of the Nile, although they crossed to capture and sack the town of Nikiou.³ The Greeks contested the approach to Alexandria, the last battle being a drawn engagement at the town of Karyūn, after which the Greeks retired in good order to Alexandria.⁴

It was impossible to take the city by assault, guarded as it was by formidable natural and artificial defences. 'Amr therefore left a detachment encamped before the city strong enough to deal

¹JN 437 f; T. 2592.

²B. 213 ff; JN 446 f.

³JN 448.

⁴B. 220.

with sorties, and went south to complete the conquest of Middle Egypt. Meanwhile Cyrus, Melkite patriarch of Egypt, had returned from Constantinople armed with a warrant from the successor of Heraclius to negotiate the surrender. He went to Babylon, where he was received cordially by 'Amr, and the treaty was concluded on 8th November 641, 28th Dhu al-Qa'da, A.H. 20 (see Report No. 40).

During the eleven month period of the armistice stipulated in the treaty the towns of the Delta were reduced after stubborn resistance, while the pacification of Upper Egypt was completed with relative ease. On 17th September 642, 16th Shawwāl, A.H. 21, 'Amr entered Alexandria at the head of his army.¹

The only other event of note in the conquest of Egypt was the recapture of Alexandria by seaborne forces from Byzantium under the command of Manuel. This was at the end of 645, about Muḥarram, A.H. 25. 'Amr was no longer in command, having been dismissed in favour of 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abī Sarḥ, but he was recalled to Egypt at the urgent request of the troops. The Greeks wasted valuable time in idleness in Alexandria and in plundering the Delta towns, and when they finally advanced 'Amr was ready for them. The battle took place near Nikiou and was

¹B. 220-221.

desperately fought, but the Arabs were eventually completely victorious and pursued the remnants of the enemy army to the walls of Alexandria. The Greeks took refuge in the city, closed the gates and prepared to withstand a siege. This time, however, one of the gates was opened by a traitor, and the Muslims rushed in and carried the city by assault, looting and slaying until stopped by 'Amr's orders. 'Amr had the walls razed to the ground to prevent the city from being used as a fortress in another rebellion of the same kind.¹

Nubia was never subdued in the early days of Islam. A raiding force sent by 'Amr was forced to retreat after suffering casualties from the accurate marksmanship of the Nubian archers. Later, in the time of 'Uthmān, a treaty was concluded; under its terms the Nubians were to supply an annual quota of slaves in return for foodstuffs.²

(b) The Termination of Hostilities.

Militarily there are three events of overriding importance in the conquest of Egypt: the Muslim victory at Heliopolis, the capture of the fortress of Babylon, and the fall of Alexandria.

¹B.221.

²B.236 f; Y.179.

The first destroyed, or at least seriously impaired, the effectiveness of the Greek armies in the field, the second gave the Muslims possession of the most important strategic site in the country, and the third put into Muslim hands the commercial and administrative capital of the South-eastern Mediterranean. It is evident that several factors decided the outcome of these decisive events, and hence of the Muslim conquest. Among these factors can be counted the fighting spirit of the Muslims, and their reputation, enhanced by their victories in Syria, Iraq, and Mesopotamia; good generalship on the Muslim side, while their enemies were poorly led; the superior mobility of the Arabs partly offset by their lack of skill in watermanship; the attitude of the indigenous population; the dissensions of the local factions; the crisis of leadership in Constantinople.

The battle of Heliopolis, or 'Ayn Shams, is not of direct concern to the writer. Suffice it to say that it appears to have been fiercely contested, to have been directed by 'Amr with tactical skill, and to have ended in a complete victory for the Muslims.

The siege and capture of the fortress of Babylon is an episode that is reported in the sources in a confused manner. Because of its proximity to the towns of Umm Dunayn and Miṣr, and because the surrender of these towns, and the region at the apex of the Delta almost certainly took place during the siege, of Babylon, it

will be best to consider all the reports dealing with this phase of the conquest together.

Before doing so, however, it is necessary to give attention briefly to the question of the identities of the authorities with whom the Muslims concluded the agreements. It is felt that Butler's assertion that Cyrus was present at Babylon is incorrect¹ and that the 'Muqawqis' mentioned in some of the Arab sources cannot be identified with him. John of Nikiou does not mention his presence and it is most probable that he was in Constantinople at the time - he was certainly there before the death of Heraclius.²

Butler's thesis that the Coptic population was leaderless and in disarray after ten years of Melkite persecution is also open to doubt.³ We know from recent history that the will to survival of a conquered people, provided they have strong feelings of ethnic or religious identity, is not easily eradicated, even by total ruthlessness allied to modern means of persuasion and suppression. Butler himself rightly stresses the tenacity of the Copts in maintaining their separate community, against pressures exerted from various sources, in the centuries following the Muslim conquest.⁴

¹Butler 250.

²JN 444; see Ca 20/209.

³Butler 252.

⁴Butler 491.

The reports to be considered for this phase of the campaign are as follows: 18, 22, 23, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53.

No. 18 is from Balādhurī, and he says that the sulh was made by the king of Alyūna - this is taken to mean Babylon, on the assumption that the first part of this word has been confused with the Arabic word bāb. This cannot, however, have meant the citadel - the garrison commander would not have made terms on behalf of the local populace - but the adjoining city of Miṣr. Leaving aside the question of taxation until later in this section, this report points to a treaty made by the chief of the town of Miṣr, on behalf of the townspeople and the people of the surrounding countryside. No. 22, which is said to have occurred after the battle of 'Ayn Shams, may refer to the same event, or to a similar one; the reference to Greeks and Nubians being allowed to leave under safe-conduct, however, shows that this event has been confused with the later treaty for Alexandria. No. 23, prolix and embroidered with fanciful details, nevertheless clearly belongs to this period, since the fall of Babylon is mentioned, and the shurūṭ are said to have applied particularly to the Copts. No. 46 does not inspire confidence, as it says that Umm Dunayn, Balhīb, and other towns had 'ahd. These two towns are far apart and their conquest took place at different times. No. 49 is at least clear in its topography; although the fort (Babylon) was not taken by assault, the

Muslims did take possession of its war materials; the reference to the townspeople again must reflect some kind of local treaty with the city of Miṣr. No. 50, from John of Nikiou, inspires confidence, and is taken to be an accurate statement of the terms of surrender for the fortress of Babylon. It is precisely the kind of arrangement which would be made between the commander of a garrison who surrendered voluntarily and the general of the besieging forces. Nos. 51 and 52, for Umm Dunayn, and No. 53, for Babylon (i.e. Miṣr) again carry the memory of the local treaties made during the siege of Babylon.

There are therefore clear indications that some kind of arrangements came into being at this time between the Muslims and the local Coptic leaders. What the precise terms of these treaties were is open to conjecture, but it is fairly certain that they would not have contained the precise stipulations such as are listed, for instance, in Report No. 22. It can be taken as an established fact that 'Amr was a great general, and such leaders, in the middle of difficult campaigns, try to ensure the well-being of their troops, and, if possible, the goodwill of the local populace. It seems likely therefore that Report No. 52 is an accurate account of the kind of arrangements made: the provision of food, clothing, and a sum of money for every Muslim soldier. That the local people were not alienated is indicated in two reports

which say that they gave assistance to the Muslims. Report No. 65 says that they did so during the march on Alexandria, and John of Nikiou says that they helped, specifically by bridge-building, at the time of the conquest of the province of Miṣr - i.e. the land at the apex of the Delta.¹

The fall of Alexandria, despite contradictions and confusion in the reports, is relatively simple to describe, once it is realised that there were two conquests, the first in A.H. 20 by capitulation, the second in A.H. 25 by force. Abū 'Ubayd, in one of his invaluable glosses, makes this point explicitly - see Report No. 17. In the reports on the fall of the city there are straightforward accounts of the first conquest and of the second, and some which confuse the two. No. 40, from John of Nikiou, gives the fullest and most reliable account of the first conquest. In the Arabic sources there are other accounts which are not significantly at variance with the one just mentioned. These are: Nos. 37, 38, 41, 42. Those which give an accurate account of the second conquest are Nos. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35. Of the remainder No. 24 is incorrect in making the conquest by force occur in the time of 'Umar, No. 25 is wrong in its dating of the first capture. No. 26 mentions the rage of Heraclius at the attempt of al-Muqawqis to arrange a surrender - al-Muqawqis in this instance

¹JN 439 f.

is certainly Cyrus - and there may well be some substance in this part of the report.¹ The second part of the statement, however, is correct for the second conquest, not the first. Report No. 34 makes a similar error, but at least in this case there is a recollection that the conquest was sulḥan not 'anwatan. No. 36 would be accurate if it applies to the second conquest, but it is undated. Finally, Report No. 39, from Michael the Syrian, is totally unreliable, since Benjamin did not return from exile until after the conquest of Egypt.²

The reports for the capture of other towns in Egypt, which were consequent upon the capture of Babylon and the surrender of Alexandria, do not repay exhaustive study. It is not always possible to identify locations from the place-names given in the sources, and the spelling of these names varies between one historian and another. Report No. 68 gives a misleading summary of the reduction of the various districts of Egypt, implying that they all took place after the fall of Babylon, and all with equal facility. In fact the only cities which offered strong resistance were the Delta towns such as Balḥīb (or Bilḥīt ?), Sulḥays, al-Khays, and Shaḥā, which were reduced with difficulty in the period between the treaty of Alexandria and its occupation.³

¹Butler 262 f.

²JN 464.

³JN 441; Reports Nos. 47, 68; see Butler 328 ff.

It now remains to be considered what form of arrangement was made for Egypt as a whole when the conquest had been achieved - i.e. after the first capture of Alexandria - and whether those terms were altered in the first years of the occupation. It has already been suggested that some form of agreement or understanding was reached between 'Amr and the leaders of the Coptic community in the region of Babylon, but this is not to say that the reports which have been linked with that period do not also contain details which apply in reality to the final settlement. Before considering what the final settlement was, the usual guld versus 'anwatan argument can be briefly disposed of, bearing in mind that the confusion that arose in the case of Alexandria has already been discussed. For the rest of the country one can do no better than refer to the words of Abū 'Ubayd in report No. 2. It can be accepted without reservation that this describes the situation exactly, and that once Byzantine military power had been broken, and the capital captured, the Copts had little choice but to accept whatever terms were imposed. Any treaties which they had made at any earlier time would have been merged into the terms of the final settlement. This does not mean, however, that these terms were necessarily severe, or that the undertakings given in the earlier agreements were all ignored or superseded. There is abundant evidence that an 'ahd or an amān, once given, was not lightly broken, although there does not appear to have been the same compunction about taxation.

This point will be discussed more fully at the end of this work, after all the evidence has been presented. It will suffice to say here that the reports about prisoners having been returned to their homes because they were dhimma people are considered worthy of confidence. These are Nos. 9, 46, 47. Supporting evidence for this comes from John of Nikiou, who says that 'Amr protected them throughout the duration of his governorship'.¹

Unless the entire corpus of evidence concerning taxation in the first settlement is to be rejected, and this does not seem to be a tenable position, the actual terms can be readily deduced. First of all, there is complete accord in the sources that a poll-tax of two dinars was imposed on every adult. The reports which include this information are Nos. 10, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 23, 26, 41, 42, 63. These come from Balādhurī, Abū 'Ubayd, Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, and Ya'qūbi, citing a number of different traditions. This tax is called variously jizya, kharāj, or is not named. It is beyond the scope of this work to enter into a detailed discussion of the meaning of fiscal terms, and the precise manner in which they were collected. For the arguments on this controversial issue the reader is referred to Wellhausen, Caetani, Dennett, Khadduri, and the Encyclopaedia of Islam.² Having examined the evidence in the sources, and read the works just mentioned, the author is

¹JN 464.

²Wellhausen, 169-187; Ca 23/521-811; Dennett, passim; Khadduri, 187-190; E.I., articles jizya, fay.

satisfied that a poll-tax was levied, and that its value, in the early years at least, was two dinars. As Dennett justly points out, if the jurists and historians were anxious to present a standardised pattern of fiscal arrangements which would tally with conditions obtaining at a later period, why then did they report a two-dinar tax as having been imposed in the time of 'Umar, when such a tax did not exist later on?¹ Furthermore, the existence of a poll-tax is confirmed by evidence from the papyri.² In this connection, there is an interesting correlation between two reports, one from Balādhurī, the other from John of Nikiou. The former, report No. 41 for Alexandria, says that al-Muqawqis had to pay 13,000 dinars and that two dinars was levied on every adult.Copt.. The latter, p.456, says that the people of Alexandria were ashamed of the opposition which they had raised over Cyrus' surrender of the city, and offered him much gold to be sent with the tribute which had been imposed. Other requirements included a land-tax (Reports Nos. 10, 15, 16, 18, 22, 35, 49); providing provisions for the Muslims (Reports Nos. 10, 16, 18, 21); providing clothing for the Muslims (Reports Nos. 10, 52); and offering hospitality for three days (Reports Nos. 23, 67). As will be observed, the existence of a land-tax has only been recorded if it is

¹Dennett, 8-11.

²Dennett, 99-114. .

clearly stated that the tax applied to land, or if the payment was said to have been made in cereal produce. In other words, the expression kharāj is not automatically taken to mean land-tax. As indicated above, the meanings of the terms kharāj and jizya have been the subject of much controversy. Both can appear in the meaning of 'tax' although the use of 'jizya' for 'land-tax' is very rare,¹ while both may also occur with their specialised meanings - 'jizya' for 'poll-tax', 'kharāj' for 'land-tax'. The only safe method seems to be to rely on the text of every report, deciding whether 'tax', 'poll-tax', 'land-tax', or 'tribute' is intended from the context.²

The stipulations for the provision of subsistence and lodgings for the Muslims occurred in surrender arrangements in all regions. They were already in operation in Syria, Mesopotamia, and 'Irāq, having probably been regularised while 'Umar was at Jābiya in year 17 (see Syrian section). The provision of clothing, however, appears to have been peculiar to Egypt.

It seems reasonable to suppose, therefore, that the conditions laid down in the first settlement of Egypt, immediately after the first conquest of Alexandria, were as follows:

1. Amān - i.e. security. This is confirmed in the report of John of Nikiou, No. 40, vi.

¹FM 154.

²Khadduri 187-190; Dennett, 12-13.

2. A poll-tax of two dinars on every adult male.
3. Provision of food, clothing, and lodging for the Muslims.

There was a land-tax, therefore, only in the sense that landowners had to provide rations for the Muslims from their produce, not a tax assessed by a proper land survey.

There are a number of reports for conditions obtaining after this period. 'Amr was deposed from his governorship of Egypt in year 25 by 'Uthmān in favour of 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd, and indeed 'Abd Allah is said to have been in charge of tax-collection even in the time of 'Umar.¹ Report No. 67, while giving mainly the same conditions as those listed above, says that the poll-tax was assessed by 'Umar according to class, as was the case in other regions. Then there is a long passage in Futūḥ Miṣr describing how 'Amr imposed the Byzantine tax system on the Copts, the tax being adjustable according to circumstances, assessed and collected by the Coptic leaders.² If this regularisation was indeed the work of 'Amr, it could hardly have been done in the early days, but must have occurred when he ruled Egypt for Mu'āwiya. Report No. 63 says that the poll-tax was doubled in the time of 'Umar, to four dinars, and this may have some connection with

¹B. 222 f.

²FM 152-153; (no isnād).

report No. 67, which gives four dinars as the amount paid by the rich. On the other hand, report No. 66 says that the jizya was doubled by the time of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik. 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr is said to have declared that he lived for seven years in Egypt, and was married in it, and that the people were burdened by more than they could bear.¹ This statement, and Report No. 62, which says that Mu'āwiya wished to increase the poll-tax, are probably affected by anti-Umayyad tendencies.

The whole tenor of the reports for the Caliphate of 'Uthmān, and for the Umayyad period gives the impression of an increasing burden of taxation. The early settlement, however, while it may not have been entirely satisfactory to the Copts, may at least have been acceptable. It was possible for the Muslims to mount major expeditions to the Pentapolis and North Africa without fear of an insurrection in Egypt, and there seems to have been no general reaction in favour of the Greeks during Manuel's invasion.

The accounts of the agreement with Nubia do not present any difficulties. There was an early raid during the first governorship of 'Amr, given in reports Nos. 54 and 56. Ṭabarī in report No. 56 says that the pact was made at this time, but this is contradicted by all the other reports; he gives year 25 for this

¹B. 217 (Wāqidī 13).

raid, and this may be correct, although report No. 61 indicates that there were several such expeditions before the agreement was finally made.

The settlement was negotiated with 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abi Sarh when he ruled Egypt for 'Uthmān. Reports Nos. 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61 refer to this, and are largely self-explanatory, with broad agreement between the various reports. In effect this was a non-aggression pact between equal parties, with provisions for barter and for free passages for either side through the territory of the other for peaceful purposes.

B. North Africa

LIST OF REPORTS

Type A1

1. 'After he had conquered Egypt, 'Amr went to the Pentapolis, and having defeated them, took an immense booty and a large number of captives, and returned to Egypt.' JN 458.
2. Bare mention of 'Amr's raid on Tripoli in year 21. Y. 179.
3. 'Amr raided Tripoli in year 22 and after some fighting he captured the city 'anwatan. He took many loads of cloth from some merchants, which he sold, and divided the price among the Muslims. B. 225 f (Bakr 6).
4. In year 22 'Amr went to Tripoli, and conquered it after a siege which lasted for one month. He plundered what was in the city. FM 171 (U. 45).
5. 'The whole of al-Maghrib was 'anwatan.' B. 217 (U. 32).
6. 'In year 25 of the Arabs they invaded Africa, where Gregorius Patriarch of Africa had revolted against Constans. They gave battle to the Patriarch, and many of his soldiers were killed. The Arabs then returned, taking possession of all the towns along the coast.' MS 440 f.
7. After a battle 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abi Sarh conquered Ifriqiyya, taking booty worth 2,520, 000 dinars.
Y. 191.

8. 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd conquered Ifrīqiyya, taking booty.
T. 2814 (Sayf 12).
9. 'Abd Allah took Ifrīqiyya in year 29. D. 148.
10. Mu'āwiya b. Ḥudayj went to Ifrīqiyya in year 34, reduced some castles, and took a large booty. FM 192 f.

Type A3

11. Tribute.

When 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abī Sarḥ went to Ifrīqiyya he was met by the king, Jurjīr, and a battle took place in which Jurjīr was killed. 'Abd Allah then sent out raiding parties who captured much booty. When the chiefs of the people of Ifrīqiyya saw that, they offered 'Abd Allah a large sum of money if he would leave the country. He accepted their offer and returned to Egypt. FM 183 (U. 45).

12. Tribute.

A similar report to 11. above. The sum is given as 300 quintals of gold. B. 226 f (Wāqidi 8).

Type B1

13. Sulh.

The people of the Fezzān made a sulh with 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ.

Type B2

14. Sulh (implied); 'Ahd.

'The Pentapolis (Anṭābulus) was conquered by an 'ahd from 'Amr.'
FM 170 (B. Lahī'a 12).

15. Sulh (implied); 'Ahd.

'Amr said from the minbār: 'no Copt has 'ahd or 'aqd with me --- except the people of Anṭābulus, who have an 'ahd which must be honoured ('ahdun yūfa lahum bihi).'
B. 217 (B. Lahī'a 5 - from Abū 'Ubayd).

16. Sulh (implied); 'Ahd.

'Amr said: 'no Copt has 'aqd or 'ahd with me except the people of Anṭābulus, who have an 'ahd which must be honoured'.
(The Arabic wording is identical with 15. above.)
FM 89 (B. Lahī'a 11).

17. Sulh (implied); 'Ahd.

'Amr said from the minbār: 'the people of Anṭābulus have an 'ahd which must be honoured'. (Again - the same wording as in 15. and 16. above). FM 170 f (B. Lahī'a 18).

18. Sulh (implied); 'Ahd.

Tripoli was taken by an 'ahd from 'Amr, in year 22.
B. 226 (Al-Layth 11).

19. Sulh (implied); 'Ahd; Written.

The people of Anṭābulus had an 'ahd in writing.
FM170 (B. Lahī'a 16).

Type B320. Sulh; Tribute

The Patriarch of Ifriqiyya made a sulh with 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abi Sarh, agreeing to pay him, 2,520 dinars if he would leave the country. T. 2818 (Wāqidī 10).

For this expedition see also Ansāb G. 27 (Wāqidī 8) where the date is given as year 27, and Ansāb G. 28 (Abū Mikhnaḥ 4).

Type B421. Sulh (implied); Kharāj.

'The people of Barqa used to send their kharāj to the governor of Egypt without anyone coming to urge them to do so. Their land was the most fertile in the Maghrib, and never saw a rebellion.' B. 224 (Wāqidī 7).

Type B522. Sulh; Jizya.

'When he had conquered Alexandria, 'Amr b. al-ʿĀṣ came to Barqa, the chief city of Anṭabulus, whose people made a sulh with him, for a jizya of 13,000 dinars, which they could raise by selling those of their children whom they wished to sell.' B. 224 (Wāqidī 6).

The same statement is found in FM 170 (no isnād), T. 2645 (Wāqidī 1), Y. 179.

23. Sulh; Jizya; Written.

'Amr b. al-'aṣ made a sulh with the people of Anṭābulus and its city, Barqa, which is between Egypt and Ifrīqiyya, after he had besieged them and fought them. He imposed the jizya on them on condition that they sold which of their children they pleased to raise the jizya. He wrote them a statement to that effect.' B. 224 (Bakr 4).

A similar statement in FM 170 (al-Layth 14).

A similar statement in AU 146 (al-Layth 7), but without mention of the written treaty.

24. Sulh (implied); Jizya; Sharṭ; Written.

'Amr wrote in his sharṭ to the Luwāta people of the Berbers of Barqa: "You must sell your children and your women to raise the jizya that is assessed upon you". And al-Layth added: "but if they were slaves, that was not lawful from them".' B. 225 (al-Layth 1 - from Abū 'Ubayd).

Type B625. Sulh (implied); Jizya; Kharāj.

'In those days no collector of kharāj used to enter Barqa, because they sent the jizya at the appointed time.'

FM 171 (U. 45).

Type C526. Ṣulḥ; Dhimma; Jizya; ʿAhd.

ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ wrote to ʿUmar that he had appointed ʿUqba b. Nāfiʿ over the Maghrib, and that ʿUqba had reached Zāwila. Between Barqa and Zāwila all the people were at peace, and obedient; the Muslims paid the sadāqa and the people of the ʿahd paid the jizya. ʿAmr said that he had imposed upon the people of Zāwila, and upon those between Egypt and Zāwila, an amount which they could afford, and had instructed all his governors to take the sadāqa from the rich and give it to the poor, and to take the jizya from the dhimmis and send it to him in Egypt. The tithe and the half-tithe were to be taken from Muslim land, and from the ṣulḥ people /the amount of/ their ṣulḥ. B. 224 f (Bakr 5).

COMMENTARY(a) Brief survey of the conquest.

Soon after the first conquest of Alexandria, in the winter of A.D. 642/643, A.H. 21/22, 'Amr mounted the first westward expedition from Egypt. The Pentapolis offered no serious resistance, Barqa immediately accepting the payment of some form of tribute, and from there 'Amr moved rapidly on Tripoli. After a siege lasting for several weeks the town was taken by assault and plundered. 'Amr then advanced to Sabratha (Arabic Ṣabra) which was also taken by force and looted. Laden with booty and captives, 'Amr then returned to Egypt.¹ In the next few years raids from Barqa were led by 'Uqba b. Nāfi', one of them reaching as far as the Fezzān.²

A large raid was undertaken by 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd when he was governor of Egypt, starting out about the end of A.D. 647/A.H.26. The Byzantine authority in Ifrīqiyya was in dissolution at this time and the Patriarch Gregory of Carthage was the virtual ruler of the country. Somewhere near the site of Qayrawān the two armies met in battle, and the Byzantines were routed, Gregory himself probably falling in the action. There was no consolidation, however,

¹B. 224 f; JN 458.

²B. 224.

because 'Abd Allah was persuaded to retire by the payment of a large sum of gold; the whole expedition took a little over a year.¹

The only other expedition mentioned in the early period was that of Mu'āwiyā b. Hudayj in A.D. 654 or 655/A.H. 34. He reduced some castles in Ifrīqiyya and took booty.²

(b) The Termination of Hostilities.

The expedition of 'Amr beyond Barqa to Tripoli, and the raids of 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd and Mu'āwiyā b. Hudayj to Ifrīqiyya need little elaboration. As the reports make clear, these were simple raids, and had little or no effect upon the later pacification of the Maghrib. Once a satisfactory amount of booty had been amassed, the expeditions returned to Egypt.

'Amr's conquest of Barqa would also seem to require little elucidation, were it not that Brunschvig has used this episode to illustrate his theory of the unreliability of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, whom, together with his principal informants, he accuses of extensive fabrications in order to make history conform to the Malikite school of jurisprudential theory.³ He mentions 'Amr's

¹B. 226 f; MS 440 f.

²FM 192 f.

³Brunschvig, 118-119.

speech from the pulpit, given in Report No. 17, and says that the wording - 'ahdun yūfa lahum bihi' is exactly that used by the Malikite jurists. Unless the writer has misunderstood him, he also says that this speech from the pulpit was not reported by Balādhurī or by Abū 'Ubayd. As report No. 15 shows, this is not the case. He also casts doubts upon the figure of 13,000 dinars, as given in Futūḥ Miṣr and Balādhurī, perhaps because of its 'magical' associations, but it can be seen from report No. 22 that this figure was also given by Ṭabari and Ya'qūbi, and the informant of Ṭabari and Balādhurī was al-Wāqidī, not al-Layth or Ibn Lahī'a, who were regarded as suspect by Brunschvig. Finally he also casts doubts upon the statement that the people of Barqa paid their tax at the appointed time, without anyone having to come and collect it. This is in reports Nos. 21 and 25. This is because the ready fulfilment of treaty terms by both parties has echoes in Malikite theory. The two reports are from Wāqidī and 'Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ respectively. It seems, therefore, that when Brunschvig indicts Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, al-Layth and Ibn Lahī'a, he must extend his strictures to include Balādhurī, Abū 'Ubayd, Ṭabari, Ya'qūbi, Wāqidī, and 'Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ. This should not be taken as meaning that doubts are cast upon the validity of Brunschvig's thesis in toto, or that the historians and traditionists never adapted, or even invented, traditions to suit the tenets of a

later doctrine or tendency. The failing is common enough, and many examples of it occur in this work. But the facts about the Barqa conquest do seem fairly simple. The report of John of Nikiou, No. 1, does not mention fighting, but merely says that they took booty and captives. The expeditions to the Maghrib passed through the Pentapolis without opposition, and they must have been able to stop there and rest, and replenish their supplies, which indicates that the populace was co-operative and docile.

The reason for the tribute having taken the form of captives, rather than cash, also seems fairly clear. The Arabs had been on active operations, or in military encampments, for over three years. There is no mention, as opposed to other theatres,¹ that women accompanied the warriors in any numbers. The Berbers are an attractive race, and nothing would have been more natural than that the Arabs should have sought this form of compensation for three years' hard campaigning. Some form of agreement was probably made, not, it may be assumed, without coercion. Later on, perhaps on 'Amr's return from Tripoli, the arrangement was probably ratified, and a money value was placed on the tribute, so that in future years it could be paid in cash or in slaves, or in a combination of the two.

¹T. 2218; 2362 f; B. 118.

Apart from the reports already mentioned, only one seems to require comment. This is No. 26: the idyllic conditions here described cannot have obtained at this time; if such a situation ever came into being it must have been at a much later period.

C. Syria

LIST OF REPORTS

(i) Jerusalem

Type A1

1. This report gives a bare mention of the conquest of Jerusalem, placing the event in the year 14.
T.2360 (I.I.6). See also Ansāb II, 495 (Wāqidi 16).

Type B2

2. Written treaty; Other conditions.

'In the year 15 of the Arabs, 'Umar came to Palestine and was met by Sophronius, Bishop of Jerusalem. 'Umar wrote him a treaty, according to which no Jew was allowed to live in Jerusalem. When 'Umar entered Jerusalem he ordered the building of a mosque, on the site of Solomon's temple.'

MS 425.

3. Sulh; Tribute?

When 'Umar was at Jābiya he sent Khālīd b. Thābit al-Fahmī with an army to Jerusalem. After fighting with the inhabitants they agreed to pay something to the Muslims from what was inside their fortress, and to deliver to the Muslims that which lay outside. 'Umar came to Jerusalem, endorsed the terms, and returned to Medina. B. 139 (Al-Layth 1). The same report is in AU 153.

4. Sulh; Unspecified terms; Written.

'Abū 'Ubayda reduced Qinnasrīn in year 16, after which he came to Jerusalem whose people asked him for sulh, which he granted in year 17, on condition that 'Umar would come in person, put the terms into effect, and write a statement of the terms for the people.' B. 139 (U 86).

Type B5

5. Sulh; Jizya.

'Umar made the sulh with the people of Jerusalem, and the jizya was taken from them. T. 2402 f (U 57).

Type C1

6. Sulh; Amān.

The sulh which 'Umar made with the people of Jerusalem was in writing, and gave them security (amān) for their lives, possessions, and churches, which were not to be occupied or destroyed. Y. 167.

Type C5

7. Sulh; Jizya; Amān; Dhimma; Sharṭ; 'Ahd; Written.

The terms of the treaty which 'Umar wrote for the people of Jerusalem were as follows: they had amān for their lives, possessions, churches and crosses. Their churches were not to

be occupied or destroyed nor were they or their domains to be diminished. No Jew was to live in Jerusalem with them. The people of Jerusalem had to pay the jizya, as did the people of other cities. They were to expel the Greeks. Those who left would have safe conduct, those who remained would have to pay the jizya. Nothing would be taken from the peasants until the harvest had been reaped. The treaty was the 'ahd of Allah and the dhimma of His apostle, and the Caliphs and the believers, so long as they paid the jizya that was assessed upon them. The treaty was witnessed by Khālīd b. al-Walīd, 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ, Mu'āwīya b. Abī Sufyān, and 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Awf. T. 2405 f (Sayf 18).

Type B6

8. Ṣulḥ; Jizya; Kharāj; 'Aqd; Written.

After Abū 'Ubayda had reduced Qinnasrīn in year 16 he came to Jerusalem, which was being besieged by 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ. Some time later the people asked to capitulate to Abū 'Ubayda, provided they were given the same terms regarding jizya and kharāj as the cities of Syria, and that they were given the same treatment as their equals elsewhere, and that the one to make the 'aqd with them was 'Umar in person. Abū 'Ubayda

communicated this to 'Umar, who came to Jābiya in Damascus and then to Jerusalem. He made the sulh with the people of Jerusalem and wrote them a treaty. The conquest of Jerusalem was in year 17. B. 138 f.

(ii) Damascus

Type B1

Sulh

9. Yazīd b. Abī Sufyān entered the city by force at the Bāb al-Ṣaghīr, and Khālīd b. al-Walīd entered by the Bāb al-Sharqī sulhan. The Muslims met in the centre, near the church of al-Maqsallāt and the city was all considered as having been taken sulhan. AU 177 (U 79).

10. Surrender.

After having defeated the Romans, the Arabs came to Damascus and made terms with the inhabitants. Other cities also submitted. MS 421.

Type B3

11. Tax; Sulh.

The sulh made by Khālīd with Damascus, stipulated that they should pay one dinar for every man, and a jarīb for every jarīb. T. 2152 f (Sayf 11).

Type B5

12. Sulh; Jizya.

Khālīd made the sulh with Damascus, and gave them a written statement; they were to pay the jizya. T. 2146 (I.I. 5).

Type C1

13. Sulh; Amān; Written.

After the usual preamble the statement from Khālīd to the people of Damascus reads: 'I have given you amān for your lives, possessions, and churches'. Abū 'Ubayd adds 'there were other words in it which I do not remember'. AU 207 (U 80).

14. Sulh; Amān.

Khālīd was besieging Damascus four days before the death of Abū Bakr. The Muslims returned to the siege after 'Umar came to power. The chief of Damascus sent to Abū 'Ubayda, surrendering the city to him, but Khālīd intensified the siege when he heard of the intention of Abū 'Ubayda, and took the city 'anwatan. Khālīd wished to take prisoners, but Abū 'Ubayda stopped him, saying that he had given them amān. The Muslims occupied the city and the sulh was confirmed. This was in Rajab, year 14. Y. 158 f.

15. Sulh; Amān; Written.

Al-Wāqidi says that Khālīd made the sulh, ratified by the bishop in writing, and that Abū 'Ubayda endorsed this. Y. 159 (Wāqidi 1).

Type C5

16. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Dhimma; Written.

The following note gives the narrative of the conquest of Damascus as told by Balādhurī; because of his method of presentation the data cannot readily be divided into individual reports.

When the Muslims had done with the fight at Marj al-Suffar they returned to Damascus - this took place fourteen days before the end of Muḥarram, year 14. Khālīd, with five thousand men whom Abū 'Ubayda had put under his command, was at the Bāb al-Sharqī. Some say that Khālīd was the commander-in-chief, but was dismissed when Damascus was under siege. 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ was at the Tūma gate, Shuraybīl b. Ḥasana at the Farādīs gate, Abū 'Ubayda at the Jābiya gate, and Yazīd b. Abī Sufyān from the Ṣaghīr gate to the Kaysān gate. The bishop who had provided Khālīd with food at the beginning of the siege used to stand on the wall. One day he talked with Khālīd and they came to terms, and Khālīd wrote him a statement; 'the people have aman for their lives, property and churches; the city walls will not be demolished, nor will Muslims be quartered in their houses. They are given the 'ahd of Allah and the dhimma of his Prophet - as long as they pay the jizya nothing but good shall befall them'. One night a friend of the bishop told

Khālīd that it was the night of the feast, and that everyone inside was occupied, and that the Sharqī gate was unguarded. During the night the Muslims entered by this gate. Meanwhile there was a fierce fight at the Jābiya gate and Abū 'Ubayda entered by force. Khālīd and Abū 'Ubayda met at al-Maqsallāt, which is the quarter of the coppersmiths.

According to other reports there was a bloody conflict at the Jābiya gate at sunrise. Seeing that Abū 'Ubayda was about to enter the city, the bishops hurried to Khālīd and capitulated. He then opened the Sharqī gate and entered, with Khālīd, with Khālīd's statement in his hand. Some Muslims said 'how can the terms be binding - Khālīd is not the commander'. Abū 'Ubayda replied that even the lowest Muslim can make binding terms on behalf of other Muslims. Abū 'Ubayda endorsed the sulh made by Khālīd, and signed the capitulation, not taking into account that part of the city was taken 'anwatan. Thus all Damascus was regarded as having been taken sulhan.

'According to Abu Mikhnaf and others Khālīd entered the city by assault, whereas Abū 'Ubayda entered sulhan. The former report is more authentic.' 'Al-Haytham b. 'Adī claimed that when the people of Damascus capitulated they agreed to give up one half of their homes and churches. Muḥammad b. Sa'd reported that al-Wāqidi said "I have read the statement

issued by Khālīd and I can find no mention of 'half the homes and churches'. The fact is that when Damascus was occupied, a large number of its inhabitants fled to Heraclius at Antioch, leaving behind many vacant dwellings, which were later occupied by the Muslims".'

'According to al-Wāqidi the conquest was in Rajab, year 14, but the date of Khālīd's statement was Rabi' II, year 15. This is because Khālīd wrote the statement with no date, but when the Muslims were preparing to set out for the Yarmūk the bishop came to Khālīd and asked him to renew the statement, and to add the names of Abū 'Ubayda and the Muslims. This Khālīd did, and inserted the names of Abū 'Ubayda, Yazīd, Shurāḥbīl, and others as witnesses. The date he put on was the date when the treaty was renewed.' B. 120-123.

(iii) All other places in Syria, Palestine and Jordan.

Type A1

17. 'All Jordan was conquered 'anwatan.' B. 115 f. Y. 159.

18. Qaysāriya was conquered by Mu'āwiya b. Abī Sufyān.

(Given in chapter for year 15.) T. 2396 f (Sayf 17).

19. When 'Umar made Mu'āwiya governor of Syria, the latter besieged Qaysāriya until he reduced it, the city having been besieged for seven years. Its conquest was in Shawwāl year 19. B. 141 (Wāqidi 1).

20. 'When Mu'āwīya at last captured Qaysāriya by storm he found in it 700,000 soldiers with stipends, 30,000 Samaritans, and 20,000 Jews. He also found 300 markets, all in good order. It was guarded every night by 100,000 men stationed on its walls.' It was taken by the treachery of a Jew, who showed the Muslims a tunnel giving access to the city, on the promise of aman for himself and his family. B. 141 f (Wāqidī 2).
21. The prisoners from Qaysāriya numbered 4000. They were sent to Medina, and settled in al-Jurf. Some were distributed among the orphans of the Anṣār, and some were used by the Muslims as clerks and labourers. B. 142 (Wāqidī 1).
22. Qaysāriya was captured by Mu'āwīya b. Abī Sufyān. Y. 172.
23. Mu'āwīya conquered Qaysāriya by force (qasran) after a siege which lasted for seven years. AU 101 (U 73).
24. Khālīd b. al-Walīd captured Qaryatayn and took booty. B. 112.
25. When Khālīd b. al-Walīd raided their cattle the inhabitants of Ḥuwwārīn, reinforced by the people of Buṣrā and Ba'labakk, fought against him, but he defeated them, killed some of them and took others captive. B. 112.
26. The district of Ḥawrān was conquered by the Muslims - no further details. B. 113.
27. This report deals with Sūwā, Qaryatayn, Ḥuwwārīn, and Marj Rāhiṭ; it merely says that Khālīd fought and defeated them

- with some killing, and took captives and booty. T. 2109.
28. In year 13 of the Arabs, Abū Bakr died and 'Umar succeeded him. He sent a force which captured Buṣṣā and destroyed other towns. MS 417.
29. This is a bare mention, in the chapter for year 14, that Abū 'Ubayda conquered Ḥimṣ. T. 2360 (I.I. 6).
30. 'After the [second] conquest of Damascus Yāzid b. Abī Sufyān came to Sidon, 'Irqa, Jubayl, and Bayrūth, with his brother Mu'āwīya leading the van. He conquered these towns easily, expelling many of the inhabitants. Towards the close of the Caliphate of 'Umar, or at the beginning of that of 'Uthmān, the Greeks restored some of these coastal towns, and Mu'āwīya again conquered them. He made repairs and stationed garrisons in them, among whom he distributed fiefs.' B. 126 f (U 20).
31. In the area of Qinnasrīn, after Khālīd b. al-Walīd had defeated the Greeks, the local Arabs told Khālīd that they had assisted the Greeks through compulsion. Khālīd accepted this statement. T. 2393 (U 56).
32. 'Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit captured a city called Balda, on the coast about two parasangs from Jabala; he took it 'anwatan. The city was later destroyed and evacuated by its inhabitants. Jabala, which was a fortification for the Greeks and was deserted by them when the Muslims took Ḥimṣ, was established

- by Mu'āwiya and guarded by a garrison. B. 133 (Abū Ḥafṣ 2).
33. 'Ubāda and the Muslims conquered Anṭarṭūs (Tortosa) which was a fortress and was evacuated by its people. Mu'āwiya built Anṭarṭūs and fortified it, giving fiefs to its garrison. He did the same with Maraḡiyya and Bulunyās. B. 133 (U 1).
34. 'Abū 'Ubayda conquered al-Lādhīqiyya, Jabala, and Anṭarṭūs through 'Ub_ada b. al-Ṣāmit, and used to put them in charge of a guard until the sea was closed for navigation. Mu'āwiya stationed garrisons in the coastal cities and fortified them.' B. 134 (Abū Ḥafṣ 3).
35. 'Abū 'Ubayda left Qinnasrīn for Aleppo, but hearing that the people had rebelled, he sent against them al-Simt b. al-Aswad who reduced the city after besieging them.' B. 145.
36. 'When we reduced the city [of Qinnasrīn, with al-Simt] we carried off cows and sheep as booty. One part he distributed among us, and the remaining part was treated according to the laws of booty (al-maghnam).' B. 145 (U 21).
37. 'The cavalry of Abū 'Ubayda roamed about until they got to Būqā, and they reduced the villages of al-Jūma, Sarḡīn, Martahwān, and Tizīn.' (In north Syria.) B. 149.
38. 'In the Caliphate of 'Uthmān when Mu'āwiya was governor of Syria, Tripoli was occupied by Sufyān b. Mujīb al-Azdī after the garrison had evacuated it. Mu'āwiya used to send a different 'amil to Tripoli every year with a large body

of troops to guard the city; but when the sea was closed
/to navigation/ the 'amil with a small band would stay
 and the rest return.' B. 127.

Type A3

39. Tax.

'The Arabs devastated Caesarea. It was captured by
 Mu'āwīya by force, who took its riches and imposed a tax
 on the population.' MS 430 f.

Type B1

40. Sulh.

'Mu'āwīya conquered Asqalān sulḥan after some fighting.

According to others it was 'Amr who first reduced it.

Later its people rebelled and were reinforced by the Greeks,
 and it was then that Mu'āwīya reduced it, settled horse-guards
 (rawābiṭ) in it and put it in charge of a garrison.'

B. 142 f.

N.B. Al-Ya'qūbī (p.180) says that Asqalān was conquered in
 year 23.

41. Sulh.

Tadmur made a sulḥ with Khālīd b. al-Walīd. (No details.)

Y. 151.

42. Sulh.

Khālīd b. al-Walīd made a sulḥ with Buṣrā. Y.151.

43. Sulh.

Khālīd made a sulh with Tadmur and with the people of Arak.

T. 2109.

Type B244. Sulh; Hospitality.

The occupants of the monasteries of Ṭabāyā and Fasīla made terms (sulh) with Abū 'Ubayda, agreeing to entertain Muslim travellers. (This was in north Syria.) B. 149.

45. Sulh; Other conditions.

The inhabitants of Tiberias made a sulh with Shurāḥbīl b. Ḥasana, agreeing to give up half their homes and churches. B. 116 (U 46).

Type B346. Sulh; Tribute.

Arak was taken sulhan by Khālīd after a siege; the people offered the Muslims a certain sum. B. 111.

47. Sulh; Tribute; Other Conditions.

Ḥimṣ made terms with Abū 'Ubayda on condition that they gave up half their houses, and that they handed over the treasure of the Greeks. 'Some made terms like the sulh of Damascus, - one dinar and food on every jarīb for ever, in good times and bad. And some made terms for an appropriate amount, to be

increased if their wealth increased, and decreased if their wealth diminished. And those were the terms for Damascus and Jordan.' T. 2392 (U 55).

48. Sulh; Tribute.

Qinnasrīn made the same sulh as Hims. T. 2394 (U 56).

49. Sulh; Tax.

Al-Bathaniyya and Hawrān made the same sulh as Damascus. (See 1. above.) T. 2154 f (Sayf 11).

50. Sulh; Tax.

Baysān made the same sulh as Damascus. (See 11. above.) T. 2158 (Sayf 12).

51. Sulh; Tax; Other Conditions.

The people of Tiberias made a sulh with Shurāḥbīl b. Ḥasana on the same terms as Damascus. They were to pay one dinar annually for every man and one jarīb of wheat or barley on every jarīb of cultivated land. In addition, they agreed to give up half their houses to the Muslims. T. 2159 (Sayf 12).

Type B4

52. Sulh; Kharāj.

Abū 'Ubayda made the sulh with the people of Hims, after a siege, for the city and its lands, on condition that they paid a kharāj of 170,000 dinars. Y. 160.

53. Sulh; Kharāj.

Abū 'Ubayda sent 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ to Aleppo and Qinnasrīn where he made terms (sulh) similar to those made by Abū 'Ubayda with Ḥimṣ. (See 52. above.) Y. 161.

Type B554. Sulh; Jizya.

Abū 'Ubayda made a sulh with the Samaritans (al-Sāmira) in Palestine and Jordan, who acted as spies and guides for the Muslims. They had to pay jizya on their heads but nothing on their lands. When Yazīd b. Mu'āwiya came to power, however, he assessed kharāj on their lands. B. 158 (U 23).

55. Sulh; Jizya.

After the battle of Fiḥl the town of Fiḥl made a sulh with Abū 'Ubayda and the jizya was imposed on them. Y. 160.

56. Sulh; Jizya.

After a siege the people made of Buṣṣā a sulh with Abū 'Ubayda and the jizya was imposed on them. T. 2125 (I.I. 4).

57. Sulh; Jizya; Other conditions.

When the Muslim armies in north Syria under Abū 'Ubayda came to Bālis and Qāṣirīn, the inhabitants made a sulh on condition that they paid the jizya or evacuated their towns. Most of them left for Byzantium, al-Jazīra, or the village of Jisr

Manbij. 'Abū 'Ubayda stationed a garrison in Bālis and settled in the city some Arabs who were in Syria when the Muslims came, and who accepted Islam after that, together with some of the Qays tribe who had come to Syria since the Muslim invasion. In Qāṣirīn he settled others but they or their descendants - refused to stay in it. Abū 'Ubayda reached as far as the Euphrates, then returned to Palestine.'

B. 150 f.

Type B6

58. Ṣulḥ; Kharāj; Jizya.

After he had completed the conquest of Damascus, Abū 'Ubayda advanced to Ḥims, whose people capitulated on the same terms as Ba'labakk. He then went on to Ḥamā, whose people met him, offering submission, and he made a ṣulḥ with them, imposing jizya on their heads and kharāj on their lands. B.131 (Abu Ḥafṣ 5).

59. Ṣulḥ; Kharāj; Jizya.

The people of Shayzar met Abū 'Ubayda, bowing before him and accompanied by tambourine players and singers. The terms of the ṣulḥ were the same as for the ṣulḥ with Ḥamā.

B. 131 (Abū Ḥafṣ 5).

60. Sulḥ; Kharāj; Jizya.

The people of Fāmiya met Abū 'Ubayda in the same manner as had the people of Shayzar. They submitted to jizya and kharāj. B. 131 (Abū Ḥafṣ 5).

Type C161. Sulḥ; Amān.

Abū 'Ubayda sent Shurāḥbīl b. Ḥasana to Jordan which was taken 'anwatan except for Tiberias, which made a sulḥ, and obtained amān for their houses and churches. Shurāḥbīl was the guarantor. Y. 159.

62. Sulḥ; Amān; Written.

The people of Qusam made a sulḥ with Khālīd b. al-Walīd, who wrote them a statement of amān. B. 111.

63. Sulḥ; Amān; Written.

After a siege the people of Aleppo asked Abū 'Ubayda for sulḥ, which he granted, and gave them an amān in writing. Y. 161.

Type C264. Sulḥ; Amān; Other conditions.

Shurāḥbīl took Tiberias (Ṭabariyya) after a siege lasting some days. The people made a sulḥ with him on condition that they had amān for their lives, possessions, children, churches

and houses, except what they should evacuate and desert; a special site was reserved for a mosque. Later, in the Caliphate of 'Umar, they rebelled and were joined by many Greeks and others. Abū 'Ubayda ordered 'Amr to attack them with 4,000 men, and he took the city on the sulh as Shurāḥbīl. According to others it was Shurāḥbīl who conquered the city the second time also. B. 116.

65. Sulh; Amān; Other conditions.

'Shurāḥbīl took easy possession of the towns of Jordan with their fortifications, which, without resistance, made terms similar to those of Tiberias. Thus he captured Baysān, Sūsiya, Afīq, Jarash, Bayt Rās, Qadas, and Jawlān, and subdued all the district of Jordan and its lands.' B. 116.

66. Sulh; Amān; Other conditions.

'Abū 'Ubayda set out for Aleppo, sending 'Iyād b. Ghanm before him. Abū 'Ubayda camped around the city, but no sooner had he done so than they asked for sulh and amān for their lives, possessions, city wall, churches, homes and the citadel. This was granted, with the exception of a site for a mosque. The one to make terms was 'Iyād, and Abū 'Ubayda endorsed them. Some reporters say that they made the sulh agreeing to share half of their homes and churches if their lives were spared. Others say that there was no one in Aleppo, the

inhabitants having gone to Antioch.. From there they agreed peace terms in writing with Abū 'Ubayda, and then returned to Aleppo.' B. 146 f.

67. Sulh; Amān; Other conditions.

Ma'arrat Miṣrīn made a sulh with Abū 'Ubayda similar to that made with Aleppo. B. 149.

67. Sulh; Amān; Assistance to Muslims.

The Jarājima (Mardaites) living in Jabal al-Lukām (Amanus) sought sulh and amān from Ḥabīb b. Maslama. Terms were made that they should act as helpers and spies to the Muslims and as a garrison in al-Lukām. They were to pay no tax, and keep any booty for themselves. 'Sometimes they acted correctly, and at other times they deviated and held friendly communications with the Greeks.' B. 159.

69. Sulh; Amān; Dhimma; Hospitality; Written.

After being besieged in their fortifications the people of Tadmur made a sulh with Khālīd b. al-Walīd, and he wrote them an amān on condition that they entertained Muslims and submitted to them, and that they became dhimma. B. 111 f.

Type C3

70. Sulh; Amān; Tribute.

The people of Ḥims resisted the Muslims and then sought refuge in the city and asked for sulh and amān. They capitulated to

Abū 'Ubayda, agreeing to pay 170,000 dinars. B. 130 (Abu Mikhnaḥ 4).

Type C4

71. Sulḥ; Amān; Kharāj; Other conditions.

'When the Muslims stood at the gates of Damascus a strong force of enemy cavalry appeared. The Muslims, under al-Simḥ b. al-Aswad, set out and met them between Bayt Liḥyā and al-Thaniyya. The enemy was defeated and fled towards Ḥimṣ, but veered away past the city. The people of Ḥimṣ saw the Muslims, and being frightened because of the flight of Heraclius, and because of what they had heard of the power, courage and victory of the Muslims, they submitted and hastened to seek amān. The Muslims gave them amān and refrained from killing them and the people brought them food and fodder.

When Abū 'Ubayda had finished with Damascus he came to Ḥimṣ and camped at the Rastan gate. The people made a sulḥ with him and he gave them amān for their lives, possessions, churches, city wall and wells, excluding one quarter of the Church of St. John, which was to be turned into a mosque. He made the kharāj a condition on those who stayed.

Some of the traditionists say that it was al-Simḥ b. al-Aswad who made the sulḥ with the people of Ḥimṣ and when Abū 'Ubayda arrived he made it take effect. Al-Simḥ divided the city into lots, each marked for a Muslim to build a house.

He also made them settle in every place evacuated by its inhabitants and in every deserted yard.' B. 130 f (Wāqidi 1).

72. Sulḥ; Amān; Kharāj.

After a siege with some fighting the people of Qinnasrīn made a sulḥ with Abū 'Ubayda on the same terms as Ḥimṣ. There were a number of the Banū Tanūkh settled in the area, and some of them accepted Islam. B. 144 f.

73. Sulḥ; Amān; Kharāj.

When the Muslims left for the Yarmūk they refunded the kharāj they had taken from Ḥimṣ because they could not protect them. The people said that they liked Muslim justice better than [Greek] oppressinn and tyrrany, and they closed the gates and guarded them. The inhabitants of o ther cities, Jews and Christians, did the same. After the Muslims were victorious they opened the gates of their cities, went out with singers and music players, and paid the kharāj. B. 137 (Abū Ḥafṣ 5).

74. Sulḥ; Amān; Kharāj.

When the Muslims took al-Lādhiqiyya 'anwatan certain Christians fled to al-Yusayyid, and later sought sulḥ and amān, agreeing to return. They were assigned to lands, and a kharāj was imposed on them, to be paid whether they increased or decreased in number. Their church was left to them, and the Muslims built a cathedral mosque. B. 132 f (Abū Ḥafṣ 6).

Type C575. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; Written.

'Umar wrote a statement for the people of Ludd, giving them amān for their lives, possessions and churches, on condition that they paid the jizya. Other towns of Palestine who joined in with Ludd were included in the statement. (This is a similar statement from the same source as 7. above, for Jerusalem.) T. 2406 f (Sayf 18).

76. Sulh; Amān; Jizya.

Khālīd came to Buṣṣā at the head of all the Muslims, and they fought against its patrician until he was forced inside the town. At last the people made a sulh, which gave them amān for their lives, property, and children, on condition that they paid the jizya. Some say that they agreed to pay one dinar and one jarīb of wheat for every adult. B. 112 f.

77. Sulh; Amān; Jizya.

'Abū 'Ubayda, at the head of an army composed of the troops of the commanders who had joined him, led the way to Ma'āb in the district of the Balqā', where they surrendered on the same sulh as Buṣṣā. Others say that Ma'āb was conquered before Buṣṣā, and still others that it was conquered by Abū 'Ubayda when he was commander-in-chief in the time of 'Umar.' B. 113.

78. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; 'Ahd.

The people of Antioch made a sulh with Abū 'Ubayda, after he had besieged the city. They agreed to pay jizya or leave, and on those who stayed Abū 'Ubayda assessed one dinar and one jarīb on every adult. Later they violated the 'ahd and Abū 'Ubayda sent 'Iyād b. Ghanm and Ḥabīb b. Maslama who reduced it on identical terms. Some say that they violated the 'ahd after Abū 'Ubayda left for Palestine, and he sent 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ, who reduced it. B. 147.

79. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; Other conditions.

In north Syria Abū 'Ubayda, with 'Iyād b. Ghanm leading the van made similar terms to those made with Antioch with various towns. These included Qūrus, Manbij, Dulūk, and Ra'bān. He made it a condition for the people of Dulūk and Ra'bān to seek for news of the Greeks and send it in writing to the Muslims. Abū 'Ubayda subdued all the province of Qūrus up to the frontier at Niqābulus. To every district which he conquered he assigned an 'amil and sent some Muslims with him, but in the dangerous places he posted garrisons. B. 149-150.

Type C680. Sulh; Amān; Jizya. Kharāj.

'In the Caliphate of Abū Bakr 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ conquered Ghazza,

Sabastīya, and Nābulus, the terms of the sulh being that they had amān for their lives, possessions and houses, and that the jizya was on their necks and the kharāj on their lands. Then he conquered Ludd and its land, Yubnā, 'Amawās, and Bayt Jabrīn, where he took an estate called 'Ajlān. He then conquered Yāfā, which according to others was conquered by Mu'āwiya. 'Amr also conquered Rafah on the same sulh.' B. 138 (Abū Ḥafṣ 7).

81. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj; 'Aqd.

After the battle of Fīḥl the inhabitants took to their fortifications. They asked for amān on condition that they paid the jizya on their heads and the kharāj on their lands; they were given amān for their lives, possessions and their city walls, which were not to be destroyed. Some say that the 'aqd was made by Abū 'Ubayda, others that it was made by Shurahbīl b. Ḥasana. B.115.

82. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj; Other conditions; Written.

Abū 'Ubayda, on his way to Ḥims, was met by the people of Ba'labakk, who asked for sulh and amān. He wrote them a treaty: 'To the inhabitants of Ba'labakk - Greeks, Persians and Arabs. You have amān for your lives, possessions, churches and houses, inside and outside the city wall, and also for your mills. The Greeks may pasture their cattle within a space of 15 miles, but may not stay in an inhabited town. After Rabi'

and Jumādā are over they are free to go where they will. Whoever of them accepts Islam has the same rights and duties as us. Their merchants are free to go into any lands which become ours by sulḥ. Those who remain must pay jizya and kharāj.' B. 130.

(iv) Other Reports on Syria, Palestine, and Jordan.

83. On the arrival of Khālīd the Muslims gathered their forces against Buṣrā, and it capitulated. They were then dispersed throughout all the Ḥawrān, which they subdued. The chief of Adhri'āt came to them offering to make a sulḥ on the same terms as Buṣrā and to make all the land of al-Bathaniyya kharāj land. The request was granted, and Yazīd entered the city and made an 'ahd with its people. Thus the two districts of Ḥawrān and al-Bathaniyya came under full control of the Muslims. From there they came to Palestine and the Jordan, invading what had not yet been conquered. Yazīd marched against 'Ammān and made an easy conquest of it, making terms similar to those with Buṣrā. He also made a complete conquest of the province of al-Balqā'. When Abū 'Ubayda came to power, all that had already been conquered. At the conquest of Damascus Abū 'Ubayda was the commander-in-chief, but the terms were made by Khālīd and Abū 'Ubayda endorsed them. B. 126.
84. 'Umar wrote to Abū 'Ubayda instructing him to station a garrison

in Antioch and never to stop their allowances. He wrote to Mu'āwīya to the same effect when he made him governor. Later 'Uthmān instructed Mu'āwīya to station troops there who would never leave, and to assign fiefs to them. B. 147 f (U 4).

85. The jizya in Syria at first was one dinar and one jarīb on every man. 'Umar made it four dinars on those who had gold, forty dirhams on those who had silver, arranging them in classes - rich, middle, and poor. B. 124 (U 3 - Abū 'Ubayd.).

86. 'Umar imposed on the people of Syria - or he said the people with gold - four dinars, and provisioning the Muslims with two mudds of wheat and three gists of oil to every man /Muslim/ every month; and to the people with silver forty dirhams and fifteen ṣā' to every man.' AU 39 f (Al-Layth 6).

87. 'According to certain reports, one of the terms imposed on the people of Damascus by Khālīd when they capitulated was that every man should give as jizya one dinar and one jarīb of wheat with some oil and vinegar for feeding the Muslims.' B. 124.

88. 'Umar wrote to the commanders of the Ajnād, ordering them to impose the jizya on every adult, which was to be forty dirhams on those with silver and four dinars on those with gold. Also, to provision the Muslims, they had to give every

Muslim in Syria and al-Jazīra two mudds of wheat and three gists of oil every month and he also assessed on them an [unspecified] amount of fat and honey.' B. 125 ('Amr 2).

89. 'Umar assessed as jizya four dinars on those who possessed gold, and forty dirhams on those with silver, in addition to provisioning the Muslims and providing three days hospitality.' B. 125 (U 2).

90. 'The sulh between the Muslims and the dhimma people was on payment of the jizya, and the towns were conquered on condition that no churches or places of worship, inside or outside the city, were destroyed, that their lives were safe, that the Muslims would fight their enemies and drive them away from them; and they paid the jizya on this condition (shart), and sulh was made between them, and a treaty (kitāb) was written on this condition, provided that they built no new churches or places of worship. All Syria and part of al-Ḥīra was like this.' AY 80.

91. 'Abū 'Ubayda made a sulh with the people of Syria [laying down] the following conditions - shart: their churches and places of worship would be left alone, but they were to build no new ones; they were to guide those [Muslims] who had gone astray, build bridges over rivers at their own expense, and entertain travelling Muslims for three days; they were not

to strike Muslims or curse them, or erect crosses in Muslim districts, or drive pigs from their houses into Muslim courtyards, or lead Muslims astray, or sound clappers at the time of the Muslim call to prayer, or bring out flags at the time of their Feast, or carry arms; they were to light fires for the guidance of Muslim expeditionary forces. They asked for one day a year - their Feast at the time of the fast - in which they could carry crosses, but no flags, and this was granted.'

This report continues with an account of how the people, seeing how the Muslims kept their promises, helped them against the Greeks - the cities which had sulh with the Muslims brought intelligence about the Greek forces to their Muslim governors. When the Muslims left for the Yarmūk, they returned the jizya and kharāj which they had taken, as they could no longer give protection. They departed with the people wishing them victory. After the battle the cities who had no sulh asked for it on the same terms as those who had made terms before, and this was granted. The earlier treaties were renewed in writing.

The report ends with the familiar passage about the Muslims wishing to divide the cities and lands between them, and 'Umar refusing to do this, because there would be nothing left for those who came after. He told Abū 'Ubayda to levy

a jizya that was tolerable for the people. AY 80-82 (U 63).

92. The chief of Buṣrā said to 'Umar that he had made a sulh with the Muslims, agreeing to provide food, oil and vinegar, and 'Umar asked that a statement be written to that effect. But Abū 'Ubayda showed him to be lying and said 'we made terms that certain things be sent to the winter quarters'. Then 'Umar decreed that a jizya be assessed according to the various classes, and that kharāj be imposed on the land.

B. 152 (Yahyā 8).

93. 'All the tithe land in Syria is land whose people deserted it, and it was given as fiefs to the Muslims, who cultivated it after it had been waste-land (mawāt) claimed by no one.'

B. 152 (Abū Ḥafṣ 1).

94. Commenting on the granting of fiefs in Syria, Abū 'Ubayd says: 'This is similar to the story of the Sawād, because the land in Syria was 'anwatan, although the cities were sulhan.' He also comments that it was certain that 'Uthmān used to give fiefs from what 'Umar had set aside. AU 284 (U 84).

95. The Companions of the Prophet, and the majority of the Muslims wished 'Umar to divide Syria as the apostle had divided Khaybar. The most persistent were al-Zubayr b. al-'Awwām and Bilāl b. Rabāḥ. 'Umar said 'I would then leave nothing for the Muslims who come after you' - and added 'Allah deliver me

from Bilāl and his companions'. He left them as dhimma people, paying the kharaj to the Muslims. AY 15 (Al-Layth 10).

COMMENTARY

(a) Brief survey of the conquest.

The campaign in Syria began in A.D. 634/A.H. 12, when three separate armies left Medina, the first led by Yazīd b. Abī Sufyān, the second by Shurāḥbīl b. Ḥasana, and the third by ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ. A Greek force was defeated at Gaza, leaving the whole of southern Palestine open to Arab raids. These raids were far-ranging, over Palestine and Transjordan, and perhaps as far as the vicinity of Jerusalem and the walls of Caesarea.¹ A Greek army was hastily assembled and advanced to Ajnadayn, which lay to the south-east of Jerusalem. In view of this danger some of the Arab forces retired to the fringes of the desert, although significant numbers remained in Palestine. Reinforcements were requested from Medina with great urgency, and towards the end of March 634/Muḥarram A.H. 13 Khālīd b. al-Walīd left ‘Irāq on the orders of Abū Bakr to go to the aid of the armies in Syria. He made his famous march through the desert, and announced his presence in Syria by a raid on a Ghassānid camp on Easter Day, 24th April, 634/19th Ṣafar A.H. 13.² He then marched to the south and effected a junction with the forces of ‘Amr and Yazīd in the

¹B. 107 ff.

²B. 110 f, 250; T. 2121 ff.

in the Wādī al-‘Araba. The combined army then advanced to Ajnadayn and gave battle, completely defeating the Byzantines.¹ The Arabs now raided throughout Palestine, only the large towns holding out, and they may have reached as far as Ḥims. The Greeks now succeeded in concentrating an army which crossed the Jordan and occupied Baysān. The Arabs, once more united under the command of Khālīd, assaulted Baysān and forced the Greeks to withdraw over the Jordan. They were followed across the river and routed at the battle of Fihl.² The Muslims were now masters of all Palestine and trans-Jordan, and they advanced to the region of Damascus, where they met and defeated a Greek army at Marj al-Ṣuffar, after which the Greeks retired behind the walls of Damascus. The Arabs then laid siege to the city, a siege which lasted for about six months. A force sent by Heraclius to relieve the garrison was defeated at Bayt Lihyā, and the city was left to its fate. There was dissension between the townspeople and the Greek commander, who left the city and retired towards the north. The city surrendered on 4th September 635/15th Rajab A.H. 14.³ The Arabs then moved north and took possession of Ḥims, also by surrender.⁴

¹B. 111 ff; Y 150 f.

²B. 115.

³B. 120 ff; Ca 14/25.

⁴B. 129 ff.

The main Arab armies wintered in Damascus and Ḥims, but during this period Shurāḥbīl subdued the whole of the province of Jordan, and reduced its cities.

In the spring a large Byzantine army, assembled in north Syria, began to move south, while seaborne forces landing at the ports of Palestine menaced the Muslim flank. Realising the danger, Khālīd evacuated Ḥims and Damascus and moved to the south-east of the river Yarmūk. This was an excellent defensive position, and also commanded the route south to Arabia. In the waiting period before the battle the Arabs received reinforcements, among whom was Abū 'Ubayda b. al-Jarrāḥ, who had been sent by 'Umar to take over the command from Khālīd. He appears to have concealed this fact from Khālīd until after the battle, in which Khālīd was the commanding general in the field. When eventually the battle was joined, the Arabs were completely victorious, and the Greek army was destroyed.¹

After the battle, which was fought on 20th August 636/12th Rajab A.H. 15, the Arabs advanced to the north and occupied Damascus, this time permanently, in December 636/Dhu al-Qa'da A.H. 15. By now Abū 'Ubayda had assumed control and distributed the various commands on a systematic basis. He himself advanced

¹B. 135 f; T. 2087; MS 420 f.

northwards and occupied the towns of Ba'alabakk, Ḥimṣ, Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, Qinnasrīn, and the rest of the country as far as Aleppo and Antioch. At the same time 'Amr b. al-ʿĀṣ occupied Palestine, while Shurāḥbīl b. Ḥasana confirmed his conquest of Jordan. The Mediterranean coastal towns of 'Akka, Sūr, Ṣaydā, Bayrūt, and their territories were conquered by Yazīd b. Abī Sufyān and his brother Mu'āwiya. The whole of Syria was now in Muslim hands with the exception of the fortified cities of Jerusalem and Caesarea; Jerusalem finally surrendered in 638/17,¹ and Caesarea was taken by force in 640/19.² Although summer raids into Asia Minor were mounted, sometimes on a large scale, in the years that followed, the Amanus range remained the effective frontier between the Muslims and Byzantium throughout the Umayyad Caliphate.

(b) The Termination of Hostilities.

The conquest of Syria thus was accomplished after several minor battles and one major, decisive battle. The battle of the Yarmūk was both preceded and followed by the reduction of towns and cities, and some of these were occupied more than once, a fact which has led to some confusion in the sources. More confusion is apparent in dating, and in chronology, so that to arrive

¹B. 139.

²B. 140 f; MS 430 f.

at an accurate and coherent account of events from the sources alone would be a very difficult task. Fortunately, the justly renowned researches of Caetani, supported by Elisséeff,¹ have elucidated the difficulties and removed most of the ambiguities, although there will probably always be certain points that will remain open to question. In the foregoing historical summary, and in the discussion of the reports which follows, the writer has usually used Caetani's results on matters of chronology. There are two points, however, neither of major importance, upon which the evidence is so open that the writer is convinced that they should be left undecided. The first concerns the date of arrival of Abū 'Ubayda in Syria, which Caetani² and Elisséeff³ place after the first siege of Damascus, while de Goeje⁴ accepts that he was present at that siege, and Gibb⁵ says that he was sent to Syria after the accession of 'Umar. Certainly, Balādhuri⁶ says that 'Umar appointed him when he acceded to the Caliphate,⁶ and his presence at the siege of Damascus is referred to in several reports (e.g. 14, 15, 16), but Caetani's thesis that a man of his

¹E.I., 'Dimashq', 279-280.

²Ca 14/133.

³E.I., 'Dimashq', 279.

⁴de Goeje, 93.

⁵E.I., 'Abu Ubayda', 158-159.

⁶B. 108.

eminence would not have been assigned to a subordinate role is worthy of attention.¹ The second point is the timing of Khālīd's departure from the theatre of operations, which Elisséeff² dates as occurring immediately after the battle of the Yarmūk, while Caetani³ says that he continued to act as one of Abū 'Ubayda's lieutenants. Ṭabarī (Sayf)⁴ mentions his presence at the Yarmūk; Balādhurī, oddly enough, does not, but he refers to Khālīd acting under Abū 'Ubayda in northern Syria.⁵ What does seem to be beyond doubt, however, as will be seen when the reports are examined, is that it was Khālīd who conducted the first siege of Damascus and received the surrender of the city.

Discussion of these points serves to illustrate the difficulties that have been encountered in arriving at an established narrative of the conquest of Syria. Similar difficulties have arisen with other episodes. Essentially, however, the basic pattern of events, as given in the summary at the start of this section, is not in doubt.

¹Ca 14/133.

²E.I., 'Dimashq', 279.

³Ca 14/116.

⁴T. 2089.

⁵B. 135f, 144.

For Damascus, Reports Nos. 9 - 16, it is clear, despite some statements to the contrary, that the city was taken sulhan by Khālīd b. al-Walīd, and that the sulh was renewed on similar terms by Abū 'Ubayda. It is noteworthy that the usually reliable sources say that amān was given, and that five of the reports mention jizya, while another, No. 11, says that there was a poll-tax of one dinar, and one jarīb. It will be seen from the reports on Syria generally - e.g. Nos. 84, 85, 86, 87, 88 - that jizya in Syria meant a poll-tax. This point is discussed at the end of this section. The two statements by al-Wāqidī at the end of Report No. 16 are credible: it was to be expected that when all hope of the Byzantines' regaining Syria had been extinguished a section of the population would have wished to leave for Byzantium. Presumably they included some people of Greek origin, officials of the State and of the Orthodox Church etc. The second remark, although it clearly shows confusion between the first and second cessions of the city, indicates that true course of events, with the first surrender having been made to Khālīd, the second to Abū 'Ubayda.

The reports for Jerusalem are surprisingly sparse and brief; only No. 7, from Sayf b. 'Umar, is given at any length. When one considers the detailed treaties that were said to have been drawn up for quite insignificant towns, or for cities in disputed frontier areas, one would have expected the reports on Jerusalem to have

been given quite special attention, particularly in view of 'Umar's presence on the scene. The reasons for this can only be conjectural. First, there was no outstanding aristocratic leader involved in the surrender, there were no heroic deeds, hence no material of prime interest to the rāwīs. Secondly, it remained largely a Christian city, of only peripheral interest to the Muslim world at the time when the histories were written. Finally, the surrender was in fact of little military significance. The rest of the region, towns and countryside, had been in Muslim hands for about two years, and Jerusalem must have depended upon Muslim goodwill for its food supplies. The surrender was therefore only a matter of time, and it was not worth the expense of effort and lives to take it by force or by close investment. The terms given were doubtless similar to those obtained by other Syrian cities, as indeed is stated by Balādhurī in Report No. 8. Again, these general points are deferred for discussion until the end of this section.

The 'A' type reports are of several kinds. Some are merely reports where no details are given: these are Nos. 28, 29, 35, 36, 37. The second series concerns the towns on Khālīd's route from 'Irāq: these are: 24 and 25, which can be taken together with the 'B' type reports Nos. 41, 43, 46, 62, 69. Of these latter 41, 41, 46 and 62 merely record some kind of temporary arrangement, and are perfectly credible, but No. 69 is suspect,

being of too 'advanced' a type to have been made during this type of expedition. These episodes have been differently interpreted by Musil¹ and Glubb.² Musil concluded that Khālīd looted sheep and cattle from herds belonging to the towns mentioned, and that these depredations became confused with assaults on the towns themselves. The inclusion of Arak and Tadmur in some itineraries may have occurred because of events at a later date, when Khālīd's descendants, living in Hims, had dealings with the Palmyrene. Glubb, drawing upon his own military experience in the area, thinks that Khālīd turned back to the north-east, and attacked the towns themselves. Since this opinion is in line with the reports, it seems that it is more likely to be the correct version.

The third category of 'A' reports deals with the reduction of towns and cities along the sea-coast, which comprise: Nos. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 30, 32, 33, 34, 38, 39. Nos. 18 - 23, and No. 39 refer to the capture of Caesarea (Qaysariya) by Mu'awiya, in year 19. This was the last major city in the region to be conquered, and it was apparently stubbornly defended by a Greek garrison. The figures given in report No. 20, however, are obviously greatly exaggerated; the number of prisoners, given as 4,000 in Report No. 21 gives a clear idea of the actual scale of

¹Musil, 553 ff.

²Glubb, 134 f.

this operation. The last of all the conquests in Syria, according to Report No. 38, was that of Tripoli, where the garrison held out until the time of 'Uthmān, and were then evacuated, presumably by sea. Referring to these coastal towns, Report No. 30 says that the Greeks returned and re-occupied some of them, and that they had to be recaptured and then garrisoned. Other reports mention the necessity for placing garrisons in these towns when the sea was open for navigation, and it is clear that Byzantine sea-power was a menace until the Muslims developed a naval strength of their own. Report No. 40 is similar to those just mentioned, since Asqalan was eventually taken by force, after it had been recaptured by the Greeks. Probably the sulh mentioned was some kind of armistice made with 'Amr b. al-'as when he was in the locality in A.H. 13.

The other type of 'A' report - Nos. 17 and 26 - refer to the occupation of land, which is another topic which will be dealt with at the end of this section.

The remaining reports are best dealt with town by town, rather than by categories. Perhaps the most important surrender, excluding Damascus and Jerusalem, was that of Hims. Reports Nos. 47, 52, 58, 70, 71, 73, refer to Hims. There were several events during the conquest in connection with Hims. These included:

1. An early raid in A.H. 13 under al-Simt b. al-Aswad.
2. The pursuit of a Greek relieving force, during the

first siege of Damascus, as far as the walls of
Ḥimṣ.

3. Occupation of Ḥimṣ after the first conquest of
Damascus, by Khālīd b. al-Walīd.
4. The final surrender to Abū 'Ubayda after the
second conquest of Damascus.¹

Most of the reports refer only to the final surrender, but No. 71 mentions the first raid, which it confuses with the second event, while No. 73 describes the evacuations of the city by the Muslims before the battle of the Yarmūk. It is evident from a reading of the sources that for many of the towns in Syria early agreements were made between raiding Muslims and various towns, the final written treaties being concluded on the establishment of Muslim dominion when the Byzantine authority had been overthrown.

After the fall of Ḥimṣ Abū 'Ubayda advanced northwards, meeting very little resistance, and made terms similar to those reached with Ḥimṣ with the towns on his line of march. These conquests are referred to in Reports Nos. 44, 48, 53, 58, 59, 60, 63, 66, 67, 72, 78, 79. Report No. 82 is similar, except that the surrender of Ba'labakk occurred before the fall of Ḥimṣ. (One of the difficulties in placing the reports into categories is that it can only be done at all by taking the texts of the reports

¹Ca 14/202; de Goeje 85 f.

as the basis for classification. In a case like this, however, where it is reasonable to suppose that the terms were similar, though the texts may differ, it is logical to group the reports together.) Report No. 57 refers to conditions on the Syrian frontier, and indicates that a section of the local population, perhaps the majority, preferred to remain under Byzantine rule, or simply did not wish to live in an unsettled frontier zone. It is also interesting as showing the beginning of the policy of garrisoning the border towns with Arabs, some of whom were new converts to Islam. These developments are also mentioned in Reports Nos. 66, 72, 79, and in Nos. 68 and 84. The so-called gulf in Report No. 68 with the Jarājima, or Mardaite, living in the Amanus is reminiscent of similar arrangements made elsewhere, e.g. with the Nubians and the Daylamites. As the report suggests, it was an agreement that was only adhered to by the mountaineers when it suited them, or at times when the Muslims were strong enough to enforce their authority. Report No. 54 mentions another special case, that of the Samaritans; as a distinct minority, having no love for Jews or Christians, they had apparently been useful to the Muslims, and were suitably rewarded. The comment about Yazīd having imposed kharāj may be tendentious, reflecting the common animosity to this Caliph. The capture of Buṣṣā is given in Reports Nos. 42, 56, 76, 83, 92. The city was conquered the first time in the early days of the

Arab invasion, after Khālīd had arrived from 'Irāq and had joined forces with other Muslim armies, particularly that of Yazīd b. Abī Sufyān. The final terms were arranged after the battle of the Yarmūk, as was the case with so many towns. As in Egypt, the early agreement was mainly concerned with ensuring supplies for the troops, while the final treaty was in line with the general settlement for the whole country. Report No. 92 makes this quite clear.

Another series of reports has to do with the conquest of Jordan. These include Nos. 45, 51, 61 and 64 - for Tiberias; Nos. 55 and 81 - for Fiḥl; Nos. 49, 65, 77 and 83 - for other places in Jordan. The situation is the familiar one of these towns having been reduced more than once - the first time in the early raiding days, when the inhabitants made some sort of temporary accommodation, the second time after the first conquest of Damascus, and the third time, the final settlement, after the Yarmūk. This is indicated in No. 64, where Tiberias is said to have rebelled and to have been reconquered in the time of 'Umar. The leader who operated in this region was Shurāḥbīl b. Ḥasana, although Yazīd b. Abī Sufyān probably made some conquests in the northern part, as stated in Report No. 83. Reports that conquests in the area were made by Abū 'Ubayda are taken to mean that he was the commander-in-chief when the final treaties were made. In the reports on Tiberias, comments on the inhabitants agreeing to give up their

houses indicate that a section of the Hellenized population left for Byzantium, and that the vacant houses were then occupied by Muslims. The same situation has already been noted in Damascus and other towns.

The final group of reports concerns Palestine. These are Nos. 50, 75 and 80. As Report No. 80 shows, 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ made Palestine his special concern in the early days of the conquest, and probably camped for a time in the neighbourhood of Caesarea, as mentioned in Report No. 40. The treaty with Ludd and other towns, which is not given here in full, is very similar to the treaty for Jerusalem, also from Sayf b. 'Umar, in Report No. 7. Despite Caetani's doubts about these documents,¹ the terms do not seem to be so very different from those reported by other sources.

In conclusion, there are a number of points of particular interest and application to Syria. Abū 'Ubayd comments, in Report No. 94, that the situation in Syria was similar to that in 'Irāq and Egypt, in that the land was 'anwatan, while the cities were ḡulhan. This is only partly true; the former ruling power had been destroyed in similar circumstances, but the resemblance ends there. In Syria agriculture was relatively less important than in the other two regions, and furthermore there appears to have

¹Ca 17/173 Note 1.

been no rural authorities with whom to negotiate. Apart from one report, No. 39, which in any case is concerned with a city, not with the land, no 'A' type treaties with conditions appear for the Syrian conquest. In Egypt and the Sawād there are, on the other hand, numerous reports which state that the peasants were required to pay taxes, to provide lodging and rations, were given dhimma status etc. In those regions the terms were imposed through the medium of the landowners - dihgāns in the Sawād, Coptic leaders in Egypt. In Syria the surrender terms were negotiated with the towns, and generally it is the people (ahl) of the towns, rather than a single leader, who are mentioned as having been the parties to the treaties. This indicates that each town and city had a municipal council that remained in being after the departure of the Byzantine military authorities. The terms were made for the towns and for the land belonging to them. This is clear from reports which say that the town agreed to pay taxes in agricultural produce, e.g. Nos. 47, 51 and 76.

According to Dennett,¹ the key to the fiscal situation in Syria is contained in the report from Ṭabarī, given here in No. 47. This tradition records the fact that there were two forms of taxation: one system stipulated a poll-tax of one dinar on every adult and a fixed amount of grain on every jarīb; the other was

¹Dennett, 59-61.

a land-tax assessed according to the harvest. Both of these, Dennett says were Byzantine taxes which the Muslims adopted, the first applying to municipal lands, the second to state domains. When state lands were given as fiefs, as stated in Reports Nos. 93 and 94, the holders paid the variable tax. The remainder paid the fixed poll-tax and tax in kind. There are a number of reports which refer to the poll-tax and the tax on produce, e.g. Nos. 11, 51, 76, 78, 87, with the amounts given as one dinar and one jarīb respectively. Other reports, however, say that 'Umar changed the system to one graded according to class, with the rich paying four dinars and the middle class forty dirhams, together with a fixed amount in farmproduce - see Reports Nos. 85, 86, 88, 89. The evidence on this point seems quite reliable, and lends support to the thesis that 'Umar regularised the fiscal arrangements for the conquered provinces while he was at Jābiya in 638/17.¹

The giving of amān is frequently mentioned in the reports for the conquest of Syria, occurring more often than in reports for other regions. This is partly to be explained by the fact that there were more important cities in Syria than in Egypt, for instance, and hence more individual reports. Most of the towns surrendered without fighting, or at least without serious opposition, and this would lead the traditionists to include in their narrative

¹Ca 17/120-171.

terms that were in accord with legal theory for places taken by sulh. The country was Christian, and the treatment for Scriptuaries, although not clearly defined, indicates that special considerations are to apply. This may also account for the frequent use of the expression 'jizya', because of its Quranic associations in this context.¹

Finally, what was the attitude of the indigenous population to their new rulers, and to the terms imposed upon them? Reading reports such as Nos. 59, 60, 73 and 91, one is given to believe that, except in Hellenized cities like Jerusalem and Caesarea, they welcomed the Muslims as deliverers from Byzantine oppression, gave them assistance, and willingly paid their taxes. Although these reports may be exaggerated, there are sound reasons for accepting their essential veracity. Brutalities may have been committed, especially in the early days, but by the time Abū 'Ubayda took over the command operations seem to have been conducted without barbarity. Certainly there are few instances, such as are reported in other theatres, of civilians being killed or taken into captivity. In return for recognising Muslim overlordship and the payment of taxes, they were allowed a degree of personal and religious freedom far greater than they had known under Byzantine rule. Nor must it be forgotten that there was already a

¹Qur. IX, 29.

considerable number of Arabs settled in Syria, who would have been sympathetic towards invaders of their own race. According to some reports - e.g. Nos. 57 and 72 - it was not long before these Arabs began to accept Islam and to fight on behalf of their new religion. Syria remained quiet in the ensuing period, providing a secure base for operations against Mesopotamia, Armenia and Asia Minor, and many of the fighting men for those operations.

D. Al-Jazīra (Mesopotamia)

LIST OF REPORTS

Type A1

1. Māsabadhān was captured after a siege 'anwatan. Some of the inhabitants, who had fled to the hills, returned to the town after the Muslims took it. (This report is given in the chapter for year 16.) T. 2477 f (Sayf 23).
2. 'Tella and Dārā refused to submit to the Arabs. That is why they took them by force and massacred the Romans whom they found there. When he had conquered all Mesopotamia, 'Iyād son of Ghanm returned to Syria.' MS 426.
3. Naṣībīn was conquered by Abū Mūsā, and Dārā by 'Iyād b. Ghanm. T. 2506 (I.I. 5).
4. Al-Ruhā, Ra's al-'Ayn, and Naṣībīn were reduced in year 19. T. 2578 (I.I. 4).
5. After a fight the eastern fort of Nīnawā was taken 'anwatan by 'Utba b. Farqad. B. 331.
6. Towns, villages and land around Mawṣil were reduced by 'Utba b. Farqad. B. 331 f.

Type A5

Jizya

7. After a siege with some fighting Qarqīsiyā was taken 'anwatan and the jizya was imposed on them. T. 2479 (Sayf 23).

Type B1

8. Surrender.

'In the year 18 of the Arabs they crossed the Euphrates because they had not been paid the tribute. The people of Edessa (Ruhā) came out and discussed terms for the city.'

MS 426.

9. Sulh.

The following passage is taken from a single long report in Balādhurī: -

'Iyād captured al-Raqqa, then al-Ruhā, then Harrān, then Sumaysāṭ, all on the same terms (sulh wāhid). Then he came to Sarūj, Raskifā, and al-Ard al-Bayḍā', conquered their lands and made a sulh with the owners of the forts that was the same as sulh of al-Ruhā. Then the people of Sumaysāṭ rebelled and he returned and reduced it. Having heard that al-Ruhā had rebelled, he camped around the city, upon which they opened the city gates. He entered the city and left an 'amil with a small band. From there he came to the villages of the Euphrates - Jisr Manbij and its dependants - which he reduced in the same way. 'Ayn al-Warda or Ra's al-'Ayn held out against him, so he left it. He then came to Tall Mawzin and took it on the same sulh as al-Ruhā. That took place in year 19. Against Qarqisiyā 'Iyād directed Ḥabīb b. Maslama who took it sulhan on the same terms as al-Raqqa. 'Iyād

captured Āmid without fighting on the same sulh as Ruhā,
 and Mayyāfāriqīn on the same sulh, and after a fight he
 took Naṣībīn on the same sulh as al-Ruhā, and he took
 Ṭur 'Abdīn, Dārā and Ḥiṣn Mārīdīn on the same terms. Qardā
 and Bāzabdā he took on the same sulh as Naṣībīn. The
 patrician of al-Zawazān came to 'Iyāḍ and made a sulh with
 him for his land on the payment of a tribute (itāwa).^{*}
 All that took place in year 19 and part of Muḥarram year 20.
 ('Iyāḍ then went on to the Armenian border and then returned
 to Syria, where he died in year 20.) After him 'Umar appointed
 Sa'd b. Ḥidhyam over al-Jazīra who died after a short while.
 'Umayr b. Sa'd al-Anṣārī was then appointed, and he took
 'Ayn al-Wardā after a sharp fight. B. 175-176.

10. Sulh; Islam.

After the battle of Qādisiyya most of the Persian garrisons
 left al-Jazīra. The people of Sinjār garrisoned the city
 themselves to keep guard over the surrounding plains, and when
 someone came to them after the fall of Fārs, they accepted
 Islam and remained in their city. AY 25.

11. Sulh.

When 'Iyāḍ was through with Khilāṭ and on his way to al-Jazīra
 he sent an expedition to Sinjār, who took the city sulhan.
 It was then settled by Arabs. B. 177 (U 13).

^{*}Should properly be a Type B3, but is left in to maintain the narrative.

12. Sulh.

After 'Umayr b. Sa'd reduced Ra's al-'Ayn he made his way across and beyond the Khābūr to Qarqīsiyā, whose people had rebelled, and he made terms similar to the first sulh. He went down the Euphrates, reducing the forts on the same terms as Qarqīsiyā until he got to Hīt. B. 178 f (^U 14).

Type B213. Sulh; Other Conditions; Written.

The patrician of 'Anāt asked Khālīd b. al-Walīd for sulh, which Khālīd granted on the following conditions: no churches or places of worship were to be destroyed; they could strike clappers at any time they pleased, except at times of Muslim prayer, and could bring out their crosses on their feast days. They had to entertain Muslims for three days and provide guides for them, which they did. A statement of sulh was written between them. Al-Nuqayb and al-Kuwātil made the same terms, and a statement of sulh was written for them also. AY 86 f (I.I. 4).

Type B314. Sulh; Tribute.

(Abū Yūsuf says that his informant was a shaykh of al-Ḥīra, well versed in the affairs of al-Jazīra, who said that he was informed by learned men who, however, did not give him the

isnāds for their statements.)

'Iyād met no opposition or enemy troops until he arrived at al-Ruhā, where the chief of the city shut the gates. Later he fled the city, leaving the inhabitants, who were mostly Nabateans (Anbāṭ) with a few Greeks. They met 'Iyād, asking for sulḥ, on the payment of a fixed sum, which they named. 'Iyād wrote to Abū 'Ubayda, who was advised by Mu'ādh b. Jabal not to accept the fixed sum, but to assess an amount which they would find tolerable, and which could be increased in good times and decreased in bad times. Abū 'Ubayda wrote to 'Iyād to this effect, and 'Iyād put the proposal before the townspeople. They disagreed amongst themselves, some preferring the variable tribute and some the fixed. 'Iyād, however, despaired of taking al-Ruhā 'anwatan, and he made the sulḥ with them for what they asked - the shaykh did not know how much this was. 'Iyād then went to Ḥarrān, whose inhabitants were Nabateans with a small garrison of Greeks, and offered them the same terms as al-Ruhā. When they saw what had happened to the city of the king, they accepted.

The people of the villages and the countryside, when they saw what had befallen the cities, asked to be given the same terms. The reporter did not know whether 'Iyād accepted or rejected this, but said that 'Iyād's successors made the country people the same as the townspeople, except that, in

addition to what the latter paid, the country people had to provide food for the Muslims. AY 22 -23.

Type B4

15. Sulh; Kharāj.

After a siege 'Iyād made a sulh with al-Raqqā, on condition that they paid the kharāj on their land and on the necks of men. The same sulh was made with al-Ruhā, Sarūj, Naṣībīn, and other towns of al-Jazīra. Y. 172.

Type B5.

16. Sulh; Jizya.

'Iyād sent 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Itbān and Suhayl b. 'Adī to al-Ruhā, and the people made a sulh with them, agreeing to pay the jizya. 'The conquest of al-Jazīra was the easiest of all the conquests.' T. 2507 (Sayf 23).

17. Sulh; Jizya.

'Iyād made a sulh with the people of al-Ruhā and the people of Ḥarrān, and imposed the jizya on them. T. 2505 f (I.I. 5).

18. Sulh; Jizya.

With the people of the western fort at Nīnawa, 'Utba b. Farqad made a sulh on condition that they paid the jizya. Those who wished to leave could do so. B. 331.

19. Sulh; Jizya.

Jizya was imposed on some monasteries in Mawṣil when they made a sulh. B. 331.

Type C220. Sulh; Dhimma; 'Aqd.

This is the Sayf b. 'Umar version of the conquest of al-Jazīra, as given in Ṭabarī:

Sayf says that when Abū 'Ubayda was besieged in Ḥimṣ by the Greeks, assisted by the people of al-Jazīra, 'Umar wrote to Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās in Kūfa to send reinforcements to Abū 'Ubayda. 'Iyād b. Ghannm, says Sayf, had gone from Syria to 'Irāq to be present at Qādisiyya, and he now set out for al-Jazīra, together with al-Qa'qā' and Suhayl b. 'Adī. The people of al-Jazīra, not knowing whether these forces were making for Ḥimṣ or al-Jazīra, left Ḥimṣ and returned home. Sayf puts these events in year 17, although other reports give year 19. T. 2498-2500.

Sa'd sent al-Qa'qā' and he was followed by 'Iyād and Suhayl. The people of al-Jazīra saw themselves between the armies of al-Kūfa and Syria and made terms with 'Iyād, but Suhayl accepted the surrender of Raqqa on behalf of 'Iyād because he was the leader in battle. At first they imposed conditions for an 'anwatan conquest, but then made a sulh and

an 'aqd, and accepted that they were dhimma people.

The people of Naṣībīn made a sulḥ with 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Itbān (from Kūfa) but they feared what the people of al-Raqqā feared, and wrote to 'Iyāḍ. At first the terms were 'anwatan, then dhimma. T. 2506-2507 (Sayf 23).

21. Sulḥ; Dhimma; Sharṭ; Aid to Muslims; Other conditions.

When 'Iyāḍ stood at the gate of al-Ruhā the people made a sulḥ on condition that they could keep their cathedral and what was around it, but they were not to build any new churches. They were to give aid to the Muslims. If they violated any of the conditions (sharṭ) they had no dhimma. A similar sulḥ to that of al-Ruhā was made by the people of al-Jazīra. B. 172 (Bakr 3).

Type C3

22. Sulḥ; Amān; Tribute; Aid to Muslims; Other conditions; Written.

The city of al-Ruhā was besieged by 'Iyāḍ, and after some fighting they asked for sulḥ and amān. 'Iyāḍ wrote the treaty: 'From 'Iyāḍ b. Ghanm to the bishop of al-Ruhā - if you open the city gate and agree to give me for every man one dinar and two mudds of wheat then I give you amān for your lives, possessions and dependants. You must guide those

who go astray, repair the roads and bridges, and advise the Muslims.' B. 174.

23. Sulh; Aman; Payment (unspecified).

'Al-'Alā' said that 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz wrote to him, saying "ask the people of al-Ruhā whether they have a sulh". So he asked them, and their bishop brought him a scroll or container in which was the statement of their sulh, which said: "This is the kitāb from 'Iyād b. Ghanm and the Muslims with him to the people of al-Ruhā. I have given them aman for their lives, possessions, women and children, their city and their mills, provided they pay what they rightly owe".' Abū 'Ubayd adds: 'In another report of Kathīr b. Hishām he says that when 'Iyād made terms with the people of al-Ruhā, the rest of al-Jazīra entered into a similar sulh to that made with the people of al-Ruhā'. AU 207 f (U 81).

24. Sulh; Aman; Tribute; Other Conditions.

With the people of Harrān 'Iyād made the same sulh as he had made with al-Ruhā. Its inhabitants opened the city gates to him and he assigned a governor to it. B. 174.

25. Sulh; Aman; Tribute; Other conditions.

'Iyād sent Ḥabīb b. Maslama and Safwān b. al-Mu'aṭṭal ahead of him, and after reducing many villages and forts, they came to Sumaysāṭ. When 'Iyād arrived he found them directing operations

against the city. With 'Iyād the people made the same terms as the sulḥ of al-Ruhā. 'Iyād used to make raids from al-Ruhā and return to it. B. 174f.

26. Sulḥ; Amān; Other conditions.

When 'Umayr b. Sa'd got to Hīt (coming from western Mesopotamia), he found that 'Ammār b. Yāsir, 'Umar's 'āmil over al-Kūfa, had sent an army for the invasion of the region above Anbār, led by Sa'd b. 'Amr. The holders of the forts had come to Sa'd asking for amān, which he arranged with them, retaining one half of the church of Hīt. So 'Umayr went away to al-Raqqā. B. 178 (U 14).

Type C5

27. Sulḥ; Jizya; Dhimma.

'Iyād made a sulḥ with the people of Ḥarrān, imposing the jizya on them and making them dhimma people. T. 2507 (Sayf 23).

28. Sulḥ; Jizya; Dhimma; Other conditions; Written.

The people of Qarqīsiyā made a sulḥ with Khālīd b. al-Walīd. The terms, and the text of the written treaty, are very similar to those given for 'Ānāt, in 13. above, except that the expressions jizya and dhimma are used. 'The treaty was not repudiated in the reigns of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, or 'Alī.' AY 87 (I.I. 4).

29. Sulh; Amān; Jizya.

'Ra's al-'Ayn held out against 'Iyād, but 'Umayr b. Sa'd, 'Umar's governor over al-Jazīra, conquered it after a fierce resistance from its people. It was entered 'anwatan, but they made a sulh on condition that the Muslims had the land, and that jizya was imposed on them - four dinars on every head. Women and children were not to be taken captive. When 'Umayr entered the city he called out "la ba'sa, la ba'sa" - and that was amān for them.' B. 176 f (U 26).

Type C6.30. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj; Other conditions;Dhimma; Written.

'On Thursday, the middle of Sha'bān, year 18, 'Iyād b. Ghanm marched to al-Jazīra with 5,000 men. (He stationed horse-guards at the gates of al-Raqqa, and raided the countryside, bringing back food and prisoners. It was harvest time.) After five or six days the patrician asked for amān and 'Iyād made a sulh with him, giving amān to all the people for their lives, possessions, children and city. He said "the land is ours, we have subdued it and secured it". He left it in their hands, however, on the kharāj basis. In addition, 'Iyād imposed jizya on their necks, on every man one dinar a year, excluding women and boys. In addition to the dinar he levied

qafizes of wheat, and some oil, vinegar and honey. When Mu'awiya came to power he imposed that as a regular tax. Then the people opened the gates and set up a market for the Muslims.'

The report continues with the text of the written treaty: 'This is what 'Iyād b. Ghanm gave to the people of al-Raqqa. He gave them aman for their lives and possessions. Their churches shall not be destroyed or occupied as long as they pay the jizya imposed on them and enter into no intrigue. They must build no new church or place of worship or publicly strike clappers or celebrate Easter Monday or show the cross in public. Signed by 'Iyād's own hand.'

'Others say that 'Iyād assessed four dinars, but the fact is that 'Umar wrote to 'Umayr b. Sa'd, his governor, telling him to impose four dinars on every man, as was the case with those who possessed gold.' B. 172-174 (Wāqidi 1). N.B. The first sentence of this report, giving the date, is also recorded in Ansāb II, 694.

Other Reports on al-Jazira

31. Abū Yūsuf says that 'Iyād imposed on every head one dinar, two mudds of wheat, two gists of olive oil, and two gists of fresh forage. His informant said that this was not guaranteed by jurists or by secure isnād, nor did he know whether these

taxes were imposed by sulh or by edict. Abū Yūsuf goes on to describe how all the people of al-Jazīra were assessed at four dinars in the time of 'Abd al-Malik. AY 23.

32. When Mu'āwiya ruled Syria and al-Jazīra for 'Uthmān he was instructed by 'Uthmān to settle the Arabs in places far from the towns and villages, and to allow them to utilize the lands which were not possessed by anyone. So he settled Banū Tamīm in al-Rābiya, and a mixed crowd of Qays and Asad and others in al-Māziḥīn and al-Mudaybir. He did the same in Diyār Muḍar. In the same way he settled the Rabi'a in their Diyār. He put garrisons with 'amils in the frontier towns and fortresses, with stipends, to guard and protect them.
- B. 178.

33. 'In the days of 'Umar none of al-Jazīra was left unconquered by 'Iyād b. Ghanm, who reduced Ḥarrān, al-Ruhā, al-Raqqā, Qarqīsiyā, Naṣībīn and Sinjār.' B. 175 (Wāqidī 3).

34. 'Iyād conquered al-Raqqā, Ḥarrān, al-Ruhā, Naṣībīn, Mayyā-fāriqīn, Qarqīsiyā, and all the towns and villages of the Euphrates sulḥan, but the open fields 'anwatan.' B. 175 (Wāqidī 4).

35. 'Iyād conquered the towns of al-Jazīra sulḥan, the lands 'anwatan.' B. 175 (Wāqidī 12).

36. 'For a while oil, vinegar, and food were taken for the provisioning of the Muslims in al-Jazīra. Later this was

reduced through the sympathy of 'Umar, and fixed at 48, 24, and 12 dirhams. In addition to this jizya everyone had to provide two mudds of wheat, two gists of oil and two gists of vinegar.' B. 178 ('Amr 1).

37. 'A part of the inhabitants having vacated Ra's al-'Ayn, the Muslims utilized their lands and cultivated them on the fief system.' B. 177 (U 26).
38. 'Umar made a gult with the Banū Taghlib when they had crossed the Euphrates, intending to settle in Byzantine territory. They were not to baptize their children, or to compel people of other religions to join theirs. They were to pay a double sadaqa - one dirham in twenty. AU 28 (U 66).

Similar reports on the Banū Taghlib in: B. 181 (U 19); B. 182 (Abū Mikhnaḥ 1); B. 182 ('Amr 3); AY 68 f (U 62).

COMMENTARY

(a) Brief Survey of the Conquest.

Al-Jazīra was invaded in the summer of 639 A.D./Rajab A.H. 18, by troops from Syria under the command of 'Iyāḍ b. Ghannam.¹ According to Michael the Syrian,² this was because the Byzantine authorities had not paid the tribute, but it is doubtful whether this was the true reason for the invasion. Mesopotamia contained important military and trading routes between 'Irāq and Īrān in the east and the Mediterranean in the west, and the Muslims, occupying both ends of these routes, could not permit a hostile power to remain in control of the centre. This, together with the expansionist tendency of Islam, provided the incentive for the conquest. The conquest was probably not quite as easy as Sayf b. 'Umar claimed it was³ but at least the Muslims did not have large regular enemy forces opposing them. The area, however, contained a number of large, well-fortified towns, which the Muslims, deficient as they were in the techniques and equipment for siege warfare,⁴ could not easily take by assault. The reduction of al-Jazīra took about eighteen months, being completed by the beginning of A.H. 20,⁵ and it was achieved by forcing

¹Report No. 30.

²MS 426.

³Report No. 16.

⁴Hill, 134 f; Beckmann, 83.

⁵Report No. 9.

the capitulation of one city after another. The method appears to have been to camp around the city while the cavalry pillaged the countryside, and prevented the gathering of the harvest.¹ The citizens, aware that they could expect no assistance from Byzantine regular forces, then surrendered for the best terms they could obtain. The capture of the city of al-Ruhā, which had been the Byzantine provincial capital, was the key event in this campaign, and its fall was the signal for a number of smaller towns to surrender.² Even so, the Muslims were not entirely without opposition, especially in places where there were still Greek garrisons, and some towns had to be taken by force.³ Ra's al-'Ayn, which refused to surrender, was too strong for 'Iyād to take by assault, and he had to leave it.⁴ Other towns were said to have rebelled after the first sulh.⁵ The reconquest of these towns, and the reduction of Ra's al-'Ayn were the work of 'Umayr b. Sa'd, who took over command in al-Jazīra after the departure of 'Iyād b. Ghanm.⁶

The conquest of the eastern part of the region was completed in 641/20 by troops advancing from 'Irāq via Mawṣil.⁷

¹Report No. 30.

²Report No. 16.

³MS 426.

⁴Report No. 9.

⁵Reports Nos. 9, 12.

⁶B. 176, 178 f.

⁷B. 331 f.

(b) The Termination of Hostilities.

The clearest picture of the conquest will be given by considering each town separately, and then by writing a conclusion, incorporating the points discussed, together with material from the general reports - Nos. 31-38. Before doing so, however, it is necessary to eliminate from further discussion the reports from Sayf b. 'Umar, Nos. 1, 7, 16 and 20. No. 27 may have some value, although even this is placed in the chapter for year 17. The other reports are a good example of two of Sayf's most notorious failings - bad chronology and Kūfic bias. His dating of the conquest of al-Jazīra in A.H. 17 hardly merits refutation; it is mentioned by no other authority, and Balādhurī and Michael the Syrian give year 18 for the start of the invasion, the former reporting that most of the operations took place in year 19. In year 17 the conquest of northern Syria was not yet complete, and it was also the year in which 'Umar came to Jābiya and called his commanders to a council, hardly the time to commence a major new campaign. Moreover, Sayf's story that in this year Abū 'Ubayda was besieged by the Greeks in Ḥims is pure fiction, or at best a confusion with the Greek advance before the battle of the Yarmūk. As far as his introducing forces from Kūfa into the conquest of al-Jazīra is concerned, one can only say again that no other authority mentions the two Kūfan leaders whom Sayf brings on to the scene; all the others are agreed that 'Iyād b.

Ghanm was the conqueror of western Mesopotamia, which was strategically and economically more important than the eastern part of the province. Even Sayf could hardly ignore the historical fact of 'Iyāq's presence, but he attempts to give him a Kūfan base by saying that he came to 'Irāq to take part in the battle of Qādisiyya, a statement for which Sayf is the sole authority. Finally Sayf is the only one of the Muslim authorities to claim that some of the Mesopotamian conquests were 'anwatan, but this claim carries no more conviction than the rest of his narrative. It is felt, therefore, that there is sufficient justification for ignoring these reports.

Taking first the most important conquest of the campaign, that of al-Ruhā (classical Edessa, modern Urfa) the relevant reports are Nos. 4, 8, 9, 14, 17, 21, 22, 23. Of these No. 4 merely gives the date of the conquest, while No. 8, from Michael the Syrian, although brief, confirms that the surrender was by negotiation, and that it was arranged by the people of the city, not by a single leader. No. 9 has the exasperating feature, common enough in the Muslim historians, of saying that a sulh was made with a certain town, in this case al-Ruhā, and then mentioning a number of other towns which made the same sulh, without ever having stated the surrender terms. It also says that the city rebelled; one can suppose that the inhabitants, having paid a sum of money to buy off the Muslims while they

gathered the harvest, then refused further tribute once the crops were safely in storage. Perhaps they then realised, as intelligence came in from other areas, that this was no mere raiding expedition, but a war of conquest, and then agreed to negotiate a final settlement. Possibly the information in Report No. 14 has some relevance to this problem, since if there was a delay while 'Iyāḍ sent to Syria for Abū 'Ubayda's opinion, some kind of truce might have been arranged while he was waiting for the reply. When the reply came, it would have been natural for the people of al-Ruḥā to put the city into a state of defence while they argued among themselves as to the type of payment which they would offer. The city would then have been kept in a state of defence while the Muslims decided whether to accept their final offer. It is interesting that, in this report, Abū Yūsuf, quoting his anonymous informant, does not use the expressions jizya or kharāj, which he employs freely in other places. This is perhaps an indication that he was scrupulous enough not to make his own interpolations. Report No. 17, from Ibn Ishāq, with its echo from Qur'ān IX, 29, emphasises this very point. Report No. 21 is another example of the type which appears to be too intolerant for the period, with its ban on the building of new churches, and the warning that any infringements will result in the loss of dhimma status. Abū Yūsuf's informant, in Report No. 14, who is taken to be a reliable witness, makes no

mention of such stipulations, and the fact that the inhabitants were bargaining from a position of strength make the imposition of stringent terms unlikely. Reports Nos. 22 and 23 are similar, except that the former specifies the terms. These are very similar to those reported for the Syrian towns, and there seems little reason to doubt them. There is, however, another report from Balādhurī with the same wording as No. 23, which is from Abū 'Ubayd, although the isnāds are not the same.¹ These two, together with Report No. 14, make it possible that the first agreement with al-Ruhā was for a fixed sum, and that the poll-tax came into being a little later. Report No. 23, and the second Balādhurī report both say that the sulh was with the people of the city, although Report No. 22 says that it was made with the bishop. Probably the bishop had the document for safe keeping, as Report No. 23 states, and this led to a slight confusion.

The other stipulations in No. 22 are common enough, and are quite credible, here as elsewhere; although conditions such as these have received less attention from the secondary authorities than have, for instance, the fiscal requirements, they are more important from the military point of view. A commander who receives the co-operation of the local population, and receives the full benefit of their knowledge of the area, is able to devote his full attention to military matters, and does not have

¹B. 174. (Dāwūd b. 'Abd al-Ḥumayd from his father from his grandfather.)

to detach large numbers of his fighting troops for garrison duties.

Next there is a series of reports for other towns which are said to have made the same sulh as al-Ruhā: Nos. 24, 25 and the other towns mentioned in Reports Nos. 9 and 14. It is assumed that Nos. 24 and 25, for Ḥarrān and Sumaysāṭ respectively, are linked to Report No. 22, and that the terms were therefore the same i.e. aman, a poll-tax of one dinar and two mudds of wheat per head, and the repair of roads and bridges, guidance and counsel. Report No. 9, which covers all the important towns in western Mesopotamia, is little more than a listing of the conquests, which, with two exceptions, were all said to have made the same sulh. The exceptions are Ra's al-'Ayn which was not reduced by 'Iyād, and Zawazān, whose patrician made a sulh with 'Iyād for his land on payment of a tribute (itāwa). This is interesting, since this type of termination, made with the chief of the city for tribute, is frequently reported from Armenia and northern Īrān, but seldom from Syria and Mesopotamia, and 'Iyād was now nearing the borders of Armenia. It could be argued that Report No. 14 embodies a sulh of this type but there are differences - the point is discussed at the end of this section. It may be, that in making this list of conquests, Balādhurī intended the reader to refer back to his account of the surrender of Raqqa (Report No. 30) in order to learn the

terms which applied generally to the cities of al-Jazīra. After all, Raqqa was the obvious starting point for the invasion of al-Jazīra, and was presumably the first to be reduced. Al-Ya'qūbī, in Report No. 15, confirms this, and implies that the terms made for Raqqa, land-tax and poll-tax, were followed by the other cities. A further difficulty is that Report No. 30 contains some dubious features; it is a typical 'fiqh' treaty, giving all the terms and expressions that came to be used as appropriate to dhimma status at a later time. All that can be said with any confidence is that there were probably a number of treaties with the major cities which applied also to towns dependent upon these cities. At a later date the taxation system for the province may have been standardised.

There are four other reports to be mentioned for western Mesopotamia. No. 3, with its reference to Abū Mūsā having conquered Naṣībīn, must surely be in error, since at this time he was still engaged in the reduction of Khuzistān, and in any case, no other source mentions his presence in Mesopotamia. Reports Nos. 10 and 11, for Sinjār, are interesting in that they refer to events not mentioned elsewhere; No. 10 indicates the unsettled conditions that prevailed after the collapse of Sasanid power, and gives an early instance of conversion to Islam. If this is read in conjunction with No. 11, however, it becomes clear that the

conversion of a section of the population probably followed the arrival in the town of a contingent of Arabs, and was not an immediate sequel to the capture of the town. Report No. 29 deals with the final conquest of Ra's al-'Ayn, and is noteworthy in that a sulh was made after the city had been entered by force. The report inspires confidence, since it is known that Ra's al-'Ayn defied 'Iyād, and hence would not have surrendered tamely.

Two reports - Nos. 13 and 28 - concern the operations of Khālīd b. al-Walīd in eastern Mesopotamia in A.H. 12-13, but these are obviously quite untrustworthy. In the first place, Report No. 28 says that Khālīd's treaty with Qarqīsiyā remained in force for many years, although Report No. 9 indicates that the town was part of 'Iyād's conquest. Furthermore, both of the texts of the alleged treaties are of the fiqh type, and are much too 'advanced' for the period in question.

The final series of reports concerns the conquest of the eastern part of the province, the relevant reports being Nos. 5, 6, 12, 18, 19 and 26. The texts of these reports are brief, and require no comment, but they do pose the question as to why the Kūfāns delayed this invasion for four years after the overthrow of Sasanid power in 'Irāq. For the date of the advance to Mawṣil is given as year 20,¹ and this date agrees with the circumstances

¹B. 331.

of 'Ammār b. Yāsir having been governor of Kūfa at the time. Also, Abū Yūsuf says that the Muslims came to Sinjār after the fall of Fārs, which is a fairly elastic date, but it can hardly have been earlier than year 20. During the period, therefore, which saw the reduction of Khuzistān from Baṣra, the capture of Jerusalem and Caesarea, the invasion of Egypt and western Mesopotamia, and the operations of 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣ in Fārs, the Kūfans remained idle, and did not even attempt the conquest of eastern Mesopotamia, a region without natural obstacles, and denuded of enemy troops. There seems, indeed, to be no acceptable reason for this inactivity, and this may be part of the explanation for the faulty chronology of Sayf b. 'Umar, who advances the true date for many events by two or three years. He may thus have attempted to conceal the temporary lack of martial enthusiasm on the part of his Kūfan brethren.

A number of reports, listed under No. 38, give accounts of the settlements with the Banū Taghlib. They were a rich tribe, with large herds of livestock, and controlled extensive tracts of country along the banks of the Euphrates. It is probable, therefore, that they obtained favourable terms, and that the tax which was imposed was not onerous. This, together with the fact that they remained Christian throughout Umayyad times, seems to have occasioned some envy and irritation in later times, and to have given rise to a number of tendentious traditions. The sadaqa

at that time was voluntary and ill-defined, so the expression 'double sadaga' used in the reports is meaningless.¹

Mention has already been made of the settlement of Arabs in al-Jazīra, a process which began before the Arab invasion of Syria.² The continuance of this colonisation under the banner of Islam is made apparent in Reports Nos. 32 and 37, but it was probably not done on the orders of the Caliph and under the direction of his governor, as stated in Report No. 32, but was rather an unsystematic occupation of lands left vacant by people who emigrated to Byzantine territory.

In conclusion, the conquest of Mesopotamia seems to have been achieved fairly swiftly, and without much bloodshed. Although there were no regular Greek or Persian forces left in the area, the cities were able to use their defensive strength as a bargaining counter, obtaining reasonable terms in exchange for their surrender. It seems likely that the revenue from the cities was levied in the form of fixed tributes, which were, however, collected by means of a poll-tax levied upon every adult citizen. Report No. 14 seems to indicate an arrangement of this kind. The requirement that the peasants provide a fixed ration to every Muslim amounted in effect to a land-tax which was independent of

¹See Ca 19/37.

²Ca 18/81.

the yield of the harvest. The meaning of Report No. 36 seems to be that this form of taxation became more and more onerous as the numbers of Muslims increased, and that it was replaced by a poll-tax graded according to social class together with some form of tax on farm produce. It is improbable that there would have been time to introduce such reforms before the death of 'Umar, and it therefore seems likely that they were brought in by Mu'āwiyā, to make the fiscal system in Mesopotamia similar to that of Syria.

The people of Mesopotamia were expected to give aid and advice to the Muslims, and no doubt did so without demur, as they were mostly Monophysites, detesting their former rulers. As in Syria, those with Byzantine sympathies left the country, and their properties were occupied by colonising Arabs. The province remained peaceable after the conquest, and provided a secure base from which the conquest of Armenia was mounted.

E. Irāq

LIST OF REPORTS

(i) The Sawād

Type A1

1. Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās wrote to 'Umar that his men had requested him to divide the Sawād among them. 'Umar wrote back and told him to find out what the 'troops on horses and camels' had acquired and divide that among them, after taking one fifth. Then he wrote: 'but leave the land and the camels in the hands of those who work them, to provide stipends for the Muslims. If you divide them among those present there will be nothing left for those who come after them'.
B. 265 f (B. Lahī'a 2).
2. 'Sawād land cannot be bought or sold. This is because it was taken 'anwatan and was not divided; it belongs to all the Muslims.' B. 266 (U 30).
3. 'Amir said 'the people of al-Sawād have no 'ahd'.
4. Exactly similar to 1. above. AU 59 (B. Lahī'a 17).

Type A2

5. Hospitality.

'Umar wrote: 'we have imposed hospitality on the people of al-Sawād for a day and a night, but if the guest is kept longer by rain or illness, he must pay from his own money'.
AU 145 (U 76). See also Ansāb II, 612 ('Amr 6).

Type A3

6. Tax.

'Umar sent 'Uthman b. Hunayf to al-Sawād and he imposed on them 48, 24, and 12 dirhams.' AU 40 (U 67). And three other similar reports - AU 40.

7. Taxes.

'Umar sent 'Uthmān b. Hunayf to al-Sawād and he assessed the land. He then imposed the following taxes: on a jarīb of vines - 10 dirhams; on a jarīb of date-palms - 5 dirhams; on a jarīb of reeds - 6 dirhams; on a jarīb of wheat - 4 dirhams; on a jarīb of barley - 2 dirhams. He imposed one dirham in twenty on their wealth in general, and on their people 24 dirhams each year, excluding women and boys.' AU 68 (U 70).

8. Taxes.

'Umar wished to divide al-Sawād among the Muslims and ordered its people to be counted; each Muslim had three peasants for his share. Then 'Umar took advice from the Companions of the Prophet, and 'Alī said "leave them to be a source of revenue and aid for the Muslims". So 'Umar sent 'Uthmān b. Hunayf al-Anṣārī, who assessed on each man 48, 24, or 12 dirhams.' B. 266 (Yaḥyà 7).

9. Taxes.

'Umar sent 'Uthmān b. Hunayf to measure the Sawād, and he

found that it was 36,000,000 jaribs, and he imposed on every jarib a dirham and a qafiz.' B. 268 f (U 15).

10. Taxes.

'Umar imposed on every jarib which was reached by water, cultivated or not, a dirham and a qafiz. And on every jarib of clover 5 dirhams, and 5 qafizes; and on every jarib of trees 10 dirhams and 10 qafizes /he did not mention date-palms⁷; and on the head of every man 48, 24, or 12 dirhams.' B. 269 ('Amr 4).

11. Taxes.

'When Al-Mughīra b. al-Shu'ba was governor of al-Sawād he wrote: "we find other crops besides wheat and barley, and he mentioned Indian peas, grapes, clover, and sesame", upon each of which he assessed 8 dirhams; he excluded palm-trees.' B. 269 f (Yahyā 1).

Type A4

12. Kharāj; 'Ahd.

Al-Sha'bī was asked whether the people of al-Sawād had an 'ahd. He replied 'at first they had no 'ahd, but when it was agreed to take kharāj from them they came to have 'ahd.' B. 266 f (Yahyā 3).

13. Kharāj.

'Aman came to 'Umar and said "I have accepted Islam - lift

the kharāj from my land". 'Umar said "your land was taken 'anwatan".' B. 268 (Yahyà 5).

14. Kharāj

In the passage Abū 'Ubayd first quotes the tradition given in 9. above, and remarks that it differs from reports such as those given in 7. and 10. above; the first gives the kharāj as a dirham and a qafīz on every jarīb, and the second type gives different taxes for different crops. 'However' says Abū 'Ubayd 'this is because 'Umar imposed the kharāj on the land in particular, since the kharāj system is a rental system, and it is as if 'Umar rented out the land for a dirham and a qafīz on every jarīb every year. This is supporting evidence to those who say "the Sawād is fay' to the Muslim". The workers on the land work for the Muslims for a fixed rental, and the rest of what they produce is theirs. But this applies only to open fields not to date-palms or other /fruit/ trees. Selling fruit before it is ripe - i.e. while it is still unripe and unpicked - is called gabāla, and is forbidden, being a form of usury.' On page 70 Abū 'Ubayd quotes a number of traditions confirming the illegality of this practice. Presumably this means that the tax on fruit could only be assessed after it had been harvested. AU 69 - 70.

15. Kharāj; 'Ahd.

The same text as 12 above (both are from al-Sha'bī). AY 16 (U 61).

Type A516. Jizya; 'Ahd.

'At first the people of the Sawād had no 'ahd, but when the jizya was taken from them they came to have 'ahd.' AU 140 (U 74). (Note that this report, and Nos. 12 and 15 are all from al-Sha'bi, and are nearly identical, but whereas Balādhuri and Abū Yūsuf use the word 'kharāj', Abū 'Ubayd uses 'jizya'.)

17. Jizya; Land-tax.

The Muslims asked 'Umar to divide the Sawād, because they had taken it 'anwatan. He refused as he feared that there would be disputes among them about the supply of water. He left the people on the land, with the jizya on their heads and the ṭasq on their land. AU 57 (U 69).

18. Jizya: Dhimma.

'Umar sent Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān and 'Uthmān b. Ḥunayf to the Sawād, and they divided up the land for the jizya. They said "whoever does not come forward to us to have the seal put on his neck has forfeited his dhimma". So they assembled - they were the first people to be conquered out of fear of the Muslims. They put the seals on their necks, and then they imposed the jizya, four dirhams on every man every month. Then they estimated the people of the villages and their chiefs, and said to the dihqān of each village "there is this amount due on your village - go and distribute it among you". And they

took from the dihqān all that was assessed on his village.'
AU 52 (U 68).

19. Jizya.

'Some say that the Sawād was taken 'anwatan even although they were not divided. Others say that they were not interfered with or taken into captivity because they did not fight or resist. Neither disputes that the jizya was taken from them. Either they were not put into a state of captivity and were free from the beginning, or if they were put into captivity, then the Imām showed clemency to them, and did not divide them, so they became free once again, like the people of Khaybar. They are free, therefore, in their witnessing, marriage laws, inheritance, and all [social] affairs. It is indeed certain that they are free because the jizya is taken from them, and it is not lawful to take the jizya except from free people.' AU 140.

20. Jizya: Dhimma.

'Someone claimed that the people of the Sawād were slaves, but this is not so because one does not take jizya (jizā' in the text) from slaves. The Sawād was taken 'anwatan, except for some forts in the mountains but people were asked to return to the land, which they did. Jizya was accepted from them, and they became dhimma people.' T. 2373 (Sayf 15).

21. Jizya (Jizā in the text); Dhimma.

'The Sawād was taken 'anwatan, except for some castles which made an 'ahd before they were conquered. The people of the Sawād were asked to return, which they did, and they were given dhimma status, and jizya was imposed.' T.2373 f (Sayf 16).

22. Jizya (Jizā in the text); Dhimma; 'Ahd.

'Those who had not broken their 'ahd were dhimmis and liable to jizya. Similarly the peasants who remained. Royal lands, lands of the king's followers, lands of those who had fled, swamps, thickets, and domains of fire temples were fay.' T. 2367 f (Sayf 8).

Type A6

23. Jizya; Kharāj;

The Muslims asked 'Umar to divide the Sawād and the people of Ahwāz and the conquered territories. 'Umar replied to them 'what will happen to the Muslims in the future'? So he left the people and the land, and put the jizya on the people and the kharāj on the land. AY 16 (I.I. 9).

24. Jizya; Kharāj; Dhimma.

'Umar left al-Sawād for posterity, considering the people as dhimmis; jizya is taken from them and kharāj from their lands. They are therefore dhimmis and cannot be sold as slaves.' Q. 25 f.

Type C226. Sulh; Dhimma.

The Sawād was taken 'anwatan but they were given sulh and considered as dhimma people, and they kept their lands.

T. 2372 (Sayf 14).

(ii) Other reports on the Sawād

27. 'Umar allotted Jarīr b. 'Abd and his men one fourth of the Sawād, and when the spoils of Jalūlā' were brought together Jarīr demanded his share. Sa'd communicated this to 'Umar who wrote back 'if Jarīr wishes to be considered as having fought for pay similar to the pay of "mu'allafa gulūbuhum" (Qur. 9, 60) then give him his pay. But if they have fought in Allah's cause they should be treated as the other Muslims'. Jarīr agreed not to take his quarter.

B. 268 (Wāqidi 13).

28. The Bājila were one fourth of the Muslims at Qādisiyya and 'Umar allotted to them one fourth of the Sawād. Later 'Umar said to Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah 'had I been responsible for what I divide I would leave you the share already given. But I see that the Muslims have multiplied so you must restore what you have taken'. Jarīr and the others did so, and 'Umar gave Jarīr eighty dinars. B. 267 (U 6).

N.B. The above reports are two of several on the Bājila in Balādhuri, pp. 267-268.

29. List of fiefs in the Sawād assigned by 'Uthman - B. 273 ('Amr 5).
Other reports on fiefs given by 'Uthmān - B. 273 - 274.
These fiefs were given to important men, e.g. Companions of the Prophet like Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās and al-Zubayr b. al-'Awwām.
30. In the time of 'Umar the kharāj of the Sawād reached 120,000,000 wāfī, which is a measure equal to one mithqāl. Ansāb II, 593 f (Wāqidi 16).
31. 'Umar confiscated in the Sawād the land of those killed in the war; the land of those who fled the country; all the land of the king and his family; every swampy place; all the Dayr Yazīd (perhaps every posting-station - Dayr Barīd?); and all the land which the king reserved for himself.' B. 273 (U 5).

(iii) Towns and villages in 'Irāq.

Type A1

32. 'Ayn al-Tamr was taken 'anwatan by Khālīd b. al-Walīd in year 13. He killed the Persian garrison and took a number of prisoners. B. 246f; 110; T. 2062 f (Sayf 8); Y. 150; D. 117 f.
33. Ubulla was taken 'anwatan by 'Utba b. Ghazwān.
B. 341, 342 (I.I. 2); D. 123.
34. Ubulla was captured by 'Utba b. Ghazwān. He took prisoners

and booty and sent the 'fifth' to Medina. T. 2384 f (Abū Mikhnaf 5).

35. When 'Utba b. Ghazwān took Ubulla, each man got two dirhams as his share of the spoils. T. 2385 (U 54).
36. Firāt was taken by 'Utba b. Ghazwān 'anwatan. B. 342 (I.I. 2).
37. Madhār was captured by 'Utba b. Ghazwān. He executed the marzubān and took booty. D. 123 f.
38. After a fight near the town in which the marzubān was killed, 'Utba b. Ghazwān captured Maysān. He left an 'amil in charge of the town. D. 124.
39. Maysān was conquered by al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba 'anwatan; prisoners were taken. Y.166.
40. The lands of Maysān were taken 'anwatan by al-Mughīra, and the marzubān was killed. D. 124.
41. Khālīd b. al-Walīd captured the forts of Udhayb and Najaf, killing the Persian garrisons. The women and children were taken prisoner, everything in the forts was looted, and the forts were destroyed. AY 83 (B. Lahī'a 4).
42. Details of the fall of al-Madā'in; after the Persian garrison and the Royal household had fled, the Muslims occupied the city where they found much booty. T. 2431 - 2450 (Several reports from Sayf); Y. 165. According to Caetani (16/232) its capture was in Jumādā II, 16.

4 Type A243. Guides.

The marzubān of Anbār provided Al-Muthannà b. Ḥāritha with guides to lead him to Sūq Baghdād. D. 121 f.

44. Aman.

Khālīd b. al-Walīd passed through Zandaward in Kaskar and reduced it; he also reduced Durnā and its territory, after some shooting by the people of Zandaward, and he gave security (aman) to its people. He then went to Hurmuzjarad and gave aman to its people. B. 242.

Type A445. Dhimma; Kharāj.

Khālīd captured Madhār 'anwatan, killing the troops and taking their families captive. The peasants became dhimma people, and paid the kharāj. T. 208 f (Sayf 1).

Type B146. Sulh.

The people of Ullays made terms (sulh) with al-Muthannà b. Ḥāritha after he had defeated a Persian force near the town. T. 2018 f (Abū Mikhnaḥ 87).

47. Sulh.

The people of Bāniqiyā asked Khālīd for sulh after they had seen him reduce some Persian forts in the vicinity.

AY 85 f (I.I. 4).

Type B2.48. Sulh; 'Ahd.

'According to some jurists, none of the Sawād has an 'ahd except the inhabitants of al-Ḥīra, 'Ayn al-Tamr, Ullays and Bāniqiyā. This was because the people of Bāniqiyā guided Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah over a ford, and the people of Ullays gave hospitality to Abū 'Ubayda [written thus, but surely Abū 'Ubayd], and gave him news of the enemy.

It was Khālīd who made the sulh with the people of al-Ḥīra, and 'Ayn al-Tamr, and Ullays. (Ullays is incorrectly written 'Ullayth'.) AY 16.

49. Sulh; 'Ahd.

'None of the people of the Sawād have 'ahd except those of al-Ḥīra, Ullays, and Bāniqiyā.' B. 245 (U 28).

50. Assistance to Muslims; Sulh.

Khālīd made a sulh with the people of Ullays on condition that they acted as spies, guides and helpers to the Muslims. B. 242.

Type B3.51. Sulh; Tax; Written.

'Yahyā b. Ādam said "I heard it said that the people of al-Ḥīra were 6,000 men on each of whom was 14 dirhams, each of 5 (qirāṭs) weight, making 84,000 dirhams in all, or 60,000

of 7 qirāts each. Khālīd wrote them a statement to that effect, which I have read". B. 243 (Yahyà 6).

52. Sulh; Tribute.

The people of al-Hīra made a sulh with Khālīd, agreeing to pay 100,000 dirhamsevery year. D. 117.

53. Sulh; Tribute.

Khālīd made a sulh with the people of al-Hīra for a certain number of dirhams and a riding-saddle. AU 82 (U 72).

54. Sulh; Tribute; Other terms.

Khālīd was met by Arab chiefs of Hīra, including Iyās b. Qabīṣa, al-Tā'ī, Kisrā's governor. These men made terms (sulh) with Khālīd, agreeing to pay 100,000, or some say 80,000 dirhams, annually; they were to act as spies for the Muslims against the Persians, and Khālīd was not to destroy their churches or citadels. B. 243.

55. Sulh; Tribute; Written.

Khālīd sent Jārīr b. 'Abd Allah to the people of Bāniqiyā, and Ibn Ṣalūbā ā dihqān came to him, refusing to fight and asking for sulh. Jārīr agreed, on condition that he paid 1,000 dirhams and a mantle. Others say that Ibn Ṣalūbā came to Khālīd and made the sulh with him. After the battle of Nukhayla Jārīr came to Ibn Ṣalūbā and received from him and from the people of al-Hīra the agreed sum and wrote a receipt. Others deny that Jārīr ever came to 'Irāq except

in the Caliphate of 'Umar. Abū Mikhnaf and al-Wāqidī, however, repeat that he came there twice. Khālīd wrote a statement for Ibn Ṣalūbā, and sent the mantle to Abū Bakr, together with the money from al-Ḥīra and the 1,000 dirhams. B. 244 f.

56. Sulh; Tribute; Written.

At Bāniqiyā the sulh was made between Khālīd and Ibn Ṣalūbā, stipulating that the latter should pay 1,000 dirhams and a mantle. Khālīd wrote him a statement to that effect. T. 2019 f (Abū Mikhnaf 7).

57. Sulh; Tribute.

Khālīd laid siege to the people of Anbār, and the Muslims set fire to places in the district. The inhabitants of Anbār made a sulh with Khālīd for payment of an amount which satisfied him so he left them in their homes. B. 246.

Type B5

58. Sulh; Jizya.

Khālīd offered the people of al-Ḥīra the three choices - Islam, jizya, or war. They chose the second, and made a sulh with him, agreeing to pay 90,000 dirhams. T. 2017 f (I.I. 3).

59. Sulh; Jizya.

The Christian Arabs of al-Ḥīra made a sulh with Khālīd,

agreeing to pay a jizya of 190,000 dirhams. T. 2040 f
(Sayf 2).

60. Sulh; Jizya.

When Khālīd took possession of al-Ḥīra he gave them sulh
and a written statement, and they had to pay jizya. Q. 42.

61. Sulh; Jizya.

Abū Bakr took the jizya from the people of al-Ḥīra after
Khālīd had conquered it sulhan; Khālīd sent the jizya
to Abū Bakr and he accepted it. (The inhabitants were Arabs,
from various tribes.) AU 27 (U 65).

62. Sulh; Jizya; Assistance to Muslims.

The chief of al-Ḥīra made a sulh with Khālīd. They had to
pay a jizya of 190,000 dirhams and act as spies for the
Muslims. T. 2019 f (Abū Mikhnaḥ 7).

63. Sulh; Jizya.

The people of al-Qādisiyya made a sulh with Khālīd and the
jizya was imposed on them. AY 83 (I.I. 4).

64. Sulh; Jizya; Written.

When Khālīd captured 'Ayn al-Tamr he killed the Arab dihqān
and took the women and children of his household captive.
Then he made a sulh with the inhabitants and imposed the
jizya on them. Khālīd wrote a treaty for 'Ayn al-Tamr and
also for the people of Ullays 'which they still have'.
AY 86 (I.I.4).

65. Sulh; Jizya.

Khālīd sent Sa'd b. 'Amr al-Anṣārī to Ṣandawdiya whose people were Christian Arabs of Kinda and 'Iyād. He besieged them for some time and then made a sulh with them on condition they paid the jizya. Some of them accepted Islam. Sa'd lived in Ṣandawdiya through the Caliphates of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān, and 'his descendants are still there'. AY 86 (I.I. 4). There is a similar story in B. 110, but the town is called Ṣandawda.

Type C166. Sulh; Amān.

Khālīd made a sulh with the people of Anbar and granted them security (amān); the Persian garrison were allowed to leave. T. 2060 f (Sayf 5).

67. Sulh; Amān.

'The people of Bāniqiyā and the people of Ullays guided Abū 'Ubayd and Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah to a ford; this is how they obtained their sulh and their amān.' AU 82.

Type C568. Sulh; Jizya; Dhimma; Written.

The chief of al-Ḥīra made a sulh with Khālīd - they were to be considered as dhimma people as long as they paid the jizya.

'Later they rebelled and tore up the treaty.' The jizya was 190,000 dirhams. T. 2372 (Sayf 3).

69. Ṣulḥ; Jizya; Dhimma; Written.

Khālīd made a treaty in writing with two dihqāns for the lands between al-Falālij and Hurmuzjird, making them dhimma people and imposing on them an annual jizya of one million or two million [dirhams]. T. 2050 f (Sayf 4).

70. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Dhimma; Jizya; Written.

The ṣulḥ which Khālīd made with Ibn Ṣalūbā was for Bāniqiyā and Bārūsmā; they were given security (amān) for their lives and were considered as dhimma people, and a jizya of 1,000 dirhams was imposed on them. T. 2016 f (I.I. 3).

Type C6

71. Ṣulḥ; Jizya; Amān; Dhimma; Sharṭ; 'Ahd; Other conditions; Written.

After negotiations Khālīd made terms with the Arab notables of al-Ḥīra, their leader being Īyās b. Qabīṣa al-Ṭā'ī.

The ṣulḥ was for 60,000 dirhams, their churches and places of worship were not to be destroyed, nor were the forts to which they repaired when attacked by their enemies. They were not forbidden from striking clappers (nawāqīs) on their feast days, nor from bringing out crosses. They were obliged to entertain Muslim travellers with food and drink lawful to the Muslims.

The text of the written treaty is given: after the usual introduction it says that the gulb is the same as for other 'People of the Book' & they were to pay the jizya. Khālid says that he counted them and they numbered 7,000 men, of whom 1,000 were old or infirm and hence not liable for tax, so the total tax was 60,000 dirhams. He goes on: 'I made it a condition (shart) for them that the covenant ('ahd) of Allah and his contract (mīthāq) was given to them provided they do not violate the covenant, or aid the infidel against the Muslims - Arab or Persian - or lead the Muslims astray. If they transgress they have no dhimma or amān, but if they keep the covenant, then we give them protection against their enemies (mana'a). If one of their slaves becomes a Muslim, he is to be sold for the best price, and that price paid to his owner. They are not to wear clothing that resembles Muslim clothing, or garments of war'. It was also stated that they could receive assistance from the Muslim treasury. AY 83 - 85 (I.I. 4).

COMMENTARY

(a) Brief Survey of the Conquest.

The first Muslim invasion of lower 'Irāq occurred in the late summer of 633/12, when Khālīd b. al-Walīd, advancing from Arabia, joined forces with al-Muthannā b. Ḥāritha of the tribe of Bakr b. Wā'il, a tribe who had been raiding the borders of 'Irāq for some years.¹ This was not a conquest in the formal sense, but followed the classic pattern of nomad raids against settled communities. The raiders would camp in the cultivated land around a town, pasture their animals in the standing corn, and damage or threaten to damage fruit trees. The town would thus be forced into the payment of tribute, which would take the form of monetary payment, and the provision of food, fodder, and other requirements for life in the desert. The principal town of the region to be reduced in this way was Hīra, once the capital of the Lakhmid dynasty, an Arab dependency of Sasanid Persia, and still inhabited by Arabs.² Other towns to be laid under tribute were Ullays and Bāniqiyā, in the latter case the sulḥ being made by its dihqān.³ The raids reached as far as Anbār, and the encampments of the Banū Taghlib. The attack on the fortress

¹B. 241-250; T. 2016-275.

²Report No. 71.

³Report No. 70.

of 'Ayn al-Tamr, however, was of a different nature, since the citadel was taken by force, and its garrison put to the sword.¹

After the departure of Khālīd for Syria the Bakr b. Wā'il continued raiding along the Euphrates, but news reached them that a Persian punitive expedition was assembling against them, and al-Muthannā sent word to Medina asking for reinforcements. This was at about the time of the death of Abū Bakr. After some delay 'Umar appointed Abū 'Ubayd al-Thaqafī, a rather obscure Muslim, to lead a small force to 'Irāq. After rapid preparations and a speedy march he arrived in 'Irāq and joined forces with al-Muthannā in the vicinity of Hīra.

After crossing the Euphrates by a pontoon bridge the Muslims were attacked by the Persians and suffered a severe defeat. Abū 'Ubayd was killed and only the skill and courage of al-Muthannā averted complete disaster and enabled the Muslims to extricate their shattered forces. This action is known as the Battle of the Bridge and took place in November 634/Ramaḡān A.H. 13.²

The year following this battle was relatively quiet. The Persians made no attempt to exploit their success by operating on the west bank of the Euphrates, and the only active force on the

¹Report No. 32.

²B. 251-252; T. 2159 ff.

Muslim side was that of al-Muthannà, who remained in the vicinity of H̱ira, whence he mounted small raids along the west bank of the river.

In the summer of 635/14 a section of the Bajila tribe from the Yemen moved into 'Irāq under the command of Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah. They arrived when al-Muthannà had retired to the desert fringes in the face of a Persian force which had re-occupied H̱ira. The combined Arab forces met the Persians at Buwayb, south of H̱ira, and inflicted a defeat on them - this was in the autumn of 635/14.¹ Another year of comparative inactivity followed. Any requests for assistance that Jarīr or al-Muthannà may have made would have been ignored by Medina while events in Syria were moving to a climax.

It is likely that news of the Arab victories in Syria prompted the Persians to mobilise their forces to expel the Muslims from the borders of 'Irāq. When news of these preparations reached Medina, 'Umar, after some deliberation, appointed Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās to lead the first real invasion against the Sasānid power. Sa'd's preparations were slow, as he depended for his fighting force on the assembly of tribal groups from various parts of Arabia. It was not until the early spring of 637/16 that he arrived in 'Irāq, and camped at Qādisiyya, on the desert fringe of the sown lands. A Persian force about 20,000 strong moved into the area to oppose Sa'd's small army of some

¹B. 253-255; T. 2183 ff.

6,000 Arabs. A lull of about four months followed, during which the Arabs sent out raiding parties who scoured the outlying villages and cultivated areas for food and fodder. It is possible that an incident in one of these raids precipitated the decisive conflict, with a skirmish developing into a battle as more and more reinforcements reached each side. The battle, which was fought in June 637/Jumādā I, A.H. 16, resulted in a complete victory for the Muslims, and the Persian losses were considerable.¹ The Muslim cavalry pursued the remnants of the Persian army to the walls of the capital, al-Madā'in, and after a brief respite the main body of the army followed them. The city was entered without opposition in July 637/Jumādā II, A.H. 16, the king and his court, together with the garrison, having fled towards the Iranian highlands. Large amounts of booty were taken at the fall of the city.²

For more than a year after the conquest of al-Madā'in Sa'd remained in the city with the bulk of his army, presumably enjoying a life of ease and luxury. During this period, in December 637/Dhu al-Qa'da 16, the battle of Jalūlā' took place. Sa'd sent a force of Muslims to the town of Jalūlā' where there was a force of Persians acting as a defensive screen for the city of Hulwān, where the king had taken refuge. The Persians

¹B. 255-262; T. 2213-2367; MS 421; Ca 16/3-117.

²B. 262-264; T. 2419 ff; MS 423 f.

were defeated, and the king was obliged to leave Ḥulwān and flee towards Isfahān.¹

Eventually, at the express order of 'Umar, Sa'd left al-Madā'in and founded the fortified camp of Kūfa, in the vicinity of Ḥīra. This was in the winter of 638/639 - end of A.H. 17.² Baṣra, a similar foundation, had been settled a little earlier by 'Utba b. Ghazwān, also acting on 'Umar's orders.³ He carried out raids, with al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba as his chief lieutenant, on the towns and villages in the neighbourhood. These two towns were at first merely encampments, but later grew into towns, and were the military bases from which the conquests of Persia and Central Asia were undertaken.

(b) The Termination of Hostilities

The conquest of 'Irāq, therefore, although it stretched over a period of four years, presents a relatively simple pattern, when compared with the conquests of Syria, Egypt, or Persia. It can be divided into the early raiding phase, which included two battles and the temporary capture of some towns and villages,

¹B. 264; T. 2439 ff.

²B. 275-289; T. 2360 ff.

³B. 346-372; T. 2378 ff.

which was followed by the real Muslim challenge to the Sasānid power ending with the battle of Qādisiyya. After this the capital fell without opposition into Muslim hands, and the Sawād, the rich alluvial plain of 'Irāq, was occupied. There was not the reduction of one fortified city after another, as in Syria or Persia, but the unopposed occupation, once Persian military power was broken, of lands cultivated by unwarlike peasants for their landlords, the dihqāns. The picture has, however, been complicated by the close attention given to the Sawād settlement, and the surrender of the 'Irāqī towns, by the Muslim historians and jurists, presumably because 'Irāq was the seat of Empire when their works were compiled. This demonstrates the lack of balance of much of Muslim historiography, when more attention is given to the fall of Hīra, which declined into obscurity with the rise of Kūfa, than to the fall of Jerusalem.

The reports which deal with the Sawād are Nos. 1-31, and it will readily be seen that the division into categories, which is quite satisfactory for other regions, is somewhat artificial in this case. This is because these reports are not narratives of individual conquests, but rather a set of quasi-legal judgements, which claim the precedent of events and opinions which are said to date back to the time of the conquest. There is nothing unique

about this, of course; the same tendency can be observed in many reports for other regions. In the other regions, however, the large number of different places conquered militates against the manufacture of a structured pattern of surrender terms, whereas in the Sawād the reports are all built around one basic event.

Most of these reports come from authors or traditionists who were especially concerned with jurisprudence - Abū Yūsuf, Abū 'Ubayd, Yaḥyà b. Ādam, Ibn Lahī'a, etc. The writer has little knowledge in this subject and is unable to comment in detail on the tendencies and motives of the various authors, and must leave this field to the specialists. Why, for instance, does Yaḥyà b. Ādam transmit two reports, No. 3, saying that the people of the Sawād had no 'ahd, and another, No. 12, saying that they had an 'ahd? The question has little practical significance in any case, since the land was taken over without consulting its owners or cultivators, who had no choice but to acquiesce in the conditions imposed by their new masters. Incidentally, Dennett does not appear to be wholly correct in stating that the term ''ahd' applies to places which surrendered voluntarily and negotiated a tribute for a fixed sum.¹ In general this is correct, but there are exceptions, as in the case mentioned above,

¹Dennett, 47 f.

and in Reports Nos. 23 and 47 for Egypt.

There is a considerable measure of agreement in the sources concerning the terms of the settlement in the Sawād. All concur in stating that 'Umar decided that in the interests of all Muslims the land should be the inalienable property of the State, and that the peasants should be left in possession to provide revenue for the Muslim exchequer. This point is made, for example, in Reports Nos. 1, 2, 8 and 17. There is also general agreement that the revenue was collected by the imposition of a poll-tax and a land-tax. The tax on the person was graded according to class, and there is no mention here, as there is elsewhere, of this tax having been altered at a later date - relevant reports are Nos. 6, 8 and 10. There are divergent traditions about the land-tax; one, as in Report No. 9, says that a flat rate of a dirham and a qafiz was imposed on every jarib; the other, as in Reports Nos. 7 and 10, says that the tax varied according to the crop. Dennett explains this by referring to a remark of Yahyā b. Ādam, given here in Report No. 11. He says that at first 'Umar imposed the Sasanid tax for grain lands of one dirham per jarib, with the added toll of one qafiz in kind. Later, after he became governor of Kūfa in A.H.22, al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba called 'Umar's attention to the fact that there were large areas of land, producing crops other than grains, which were escaping just taxation. As a result, 'Umar issued a new series of rates, covering

different crops, but the traditions represented the two different acts as occurring at the same time.¹ Dennett deduces from this that the Caliph could, and did, alter the rates of land-tax if he wished.² That the Caliph had this discretion cannot be doubted but it seems that another explanation for the two traditions is at least worthy of consideration, and that is the one offered by Abū 'Ubayd, in Report No. 14. In effect he says that the dirham and the qafiz were rent for the land, whereas the fruit crops could only be assessed for tax after they had been picked (and presumably weighed). To assess them while they were still unripe was a form of usury.

The third type of levy imposed upon the people of the Sawād was the provision of hospitality to Muslims for one day and one night. This is given in Report No. 5, which covers two traditions, one from Abū 'Ubayd and one from Balādhurī.

As Report No. 18 makes clear, the taxation was not imposed on the people directly by Muslim agents, but through the medium of their landlords, the dihqāns. These men were virtual rulers of the lands which they possessed and had the power to arrange surrender terms for their estates, as will be seen below. After the battle of Qādisiyya, however, there was obviously no necessity

¹Dennett 22 ff.

²Dennett 41 f.

for the Muslims to negotiate with the dihqāns, since there was no longer any effective power opposing them. The terms were merely imposed on the peasants through the agency of the dihqāns. Shortly after the conquest a number of them are said to have embraced Islam, partly perhaps in order to continue in power and authority, but also in order to avoid the stigma of paying the poll-tax.¹

Some of the land, as mentioned in Reports Nos. 22 and 31, became the direct property of the Muslim state. This was former Royal domain, land which had been deserted by its owners, uncultivated and desert land. There is no record that the peasants on this type of land were treated any differently for tax purposes than were those on land which was still in the possession of the dihqāns. Alienation of this state property was illegal, but the Caliph had the right to dispose of it if he so wished.² That this was done is evident in the various traditions listed under Report No. 29. The beneficiaries were powerful Muslims, usually Companions of the Prophet, and it is doubtful whether 'Uthmān had the power to refuse their wishes, even if he had wished to do so.

There are a number of reports, of which Nos. 27 and 28 are typical, on the special case of the Bājila tribe, and its leader,

¹B. 265.

²Dennett, 25 f.

Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah. Some sort of undertaking seems to have been made by 'Umar to Jarīr before he left for 'Irāq, but it seems unlikely that this was a promise to allot to him one fourth of the Sawād. It is significant that Jarīr and his men left for 'Irāq not with the army of Sa'd in A.H. 16, but in A.H. 14, after the battle of the Bridge. At this time, before the battle of the Yarmūk, 'Umar may not yet have foreseen the conquest of Syria and 'Irāq, and would therefore not have been in a position to have made such a promise. From Report No. 27 the impression is gained that it was a question of booty, not land that had been discussed between the two leaders, and it may well be that 'Umar had promised Jarīr one quarter of the ghanīma in order to induce him to go to 'Irāq, rather than to Syria, which at the time was the more attractive theatre of operations. A quarter of the spoils was, after all, commonly the share of the leader in pre-Islamic times.¹ That Jarīr was content with a compensation of 80 dinars, indicates that the amount in question was not large, although one may imagine that he was also moved by the appeal to his Muslim sentiments.

For the other places in 'Irāq the first group of 'A' type reports deal with the raids of 'Utba b. Ghazwān and al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba in the Baṣra area, at some period before the battle

¹ E.I., 'Ghanīma' 1004 f.

of Qadisiyya. These are Nos. 33-40, and it is evident from the tenor of these traditions that these were indeed simply predatory raids, not the beginnings of a full-scale conquest.

Report No. 32 covers several traditions for the capture of 'Ayn al-Tamr. Balādhurī says that the garrison were Persians, who were put to death after their fort was taken by assault.¹ Referring to Report No. 64, however, we find that Abū Yūsuf, quoting Ibn Ishāq, says that the dihqan was an Arab. After he was killed, and the people of his household made captive, Khālīd made a sulh with the rest of the inhabitants, and wrote them a treaty. Whichever of these is the correct version, the fact remains that Khālīd was opposed by hostile forces, and once these had been disposed of he made terms with the people in the town adjacent to the fort.

Report No. 42 embraces a number of traditions on the fall of al-Madā'in. Despite the lengthy treatment given to this episode in Tabari, the fall of this undefended city had little military significance. It appears to have been merely plundered and then occupied, and there is no mention of the terms that were imposed upon the inhabitants.

The other 'A' type reports concern the operations of Khālīd and al-Muthannā during the first campaign in 'Irāq - Nos. 41, 43,

¹B. 246 f.

44 and 45. They merit little attention, except to comment that Sayf b. 'Umar, in Report No. 45, is obviously anticipating events by several years in stating that the peasants became dhimma people and paid the kharāj.

The reports for Hira will now be considered as a whole; these are Nos. 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 68 and 71. There is general agreement in these reports that it was Khālīd b. al-Walīd who made the terms with the town, and that there was a payment of tribute included in the conditions. Some of the writers refer to this payment as 'jizya', e.g. Nos. 60, 68 and 71, and the amounts quoted vary considerably. Some accounts state that the sum was to be paid annually, while others are silent on this point. The degree of detail also varies widely, from Report No. 53, which merely says that Khālīd made the sulh for a sum of money and a riding saddle, to the very full terms given in Report No. 71. There does not appear to be any special significance in the origin of these two reports, the first from Abū 'Ubayd citing the father of al-Aswad b. Qays, the second from Abū Yūsuf citing Ibn Ishāq. Caetani thought that the details in the second account regarding the calculation of the jizya carried conviction, and similar remarks are made by Yahyā b. Ādam in Report No. 51. There is nothing inherently improbable in the tribute having been calculated in this way, and of course such statements are not contradicted by reports which

fail to add these details. Other conditions that were said to have been stipulated included the provision of hospitality (No. 71), and acting as spies or guides (No. 54). Such terms are reported in all areas, and are quite credible, especially for an army operating in unfamiliar territory, with enemy forces in the area. What cannot be accepted, however, are the anti-Christian measures given in Report No. 71, and the intolerant tone of much of this tradition. These are common in the 'fiqh' type of report, about whose authenticity serious doubts have been expressed elsewhere in this work. The assertion, in Report No. 68, that the people of Ḥīra rebelled and tore up the treaty, presumably refers to the Persian re-occupation of the town after the battle of the Bridge, but there is ample evidence in other reports that the treaty remained in force after the final conquest of 'Irāq. To summarise for Ḥīra, there was a negotiated surrender between the Arab inhabitants of the town and the Muslims, led by Khālīd b. al-Walīd. The terms included the payment of a tribute, perhaps based on the population, but paid as a lump sum, the provision of guides and spies, and hospitality. The treaty was in writing and remained in force after the final conquest.

It is probable that similar terms were agreed with the dihqān Ibn Ṣalūbā, for the towns of Bāniqiyā and Bārūsmā, mentioned in Reports Nos. 47, 48, 49, 55, 56, 67 and 70. Incidentally it is unlikely that Jarīr b. 'Abd Allāh was in 'Irāq at the same time

as Khalid, despite the assertion to the contrary by Abū Mukhnaf and Waqidi reported by Balādhurī in Report No. 55. Balādhurī himself, in the same passage, says that others denied that he came to 'Irāq except in the Caliphate of 'Umar, and in fact there are no other reports of his presence there until after the battle of the Bridge.

A clear indication of the provisional and limited nature of these early treaties is given in Reports Nos. 48 and 67, where the 'ahd or sulh is said to have been given to the people of 'Irāqī towns in return for quite minor services rendered to the Muslims. Similarly, the small tribute of one thousand dirhams mentioned in Reports Nos. 56 and 70 adds to the impression given of small-scale operations. Nevertheless, the evidence is preponderantly in favour of these treaties having been honoured by the Muslims when they assumed full power in 'Irāq. This applies particularly to Hīra, and to the agreement with Ibn Ṣalūbā, and also probably to Ullays, mentioned in Reports Nos. 46, 48, 50 and 67. For these three cases the sources are in general agreement, and there are no positive statements to the contrary.

There is no evidence that the Muslims considered that any other towns had treaties of continuing validity. There are three reports for Anbār, Nos. 43, 57 and 66, all of which give the impression of a temporary agreement exacted by standard raiding

techniques. No. 43 says that the Muslim leader was al-Muthannā, and it was probably he, and not Khālīd, who was concerned in the operations upstream from Anbār. Ṭabari gives a detailed account of his raiding activities in this area after the departure of Khālīd.¹ The story of Sa'd b. 'Amr and the town of Ṣandawdiya or Ṣandawda, given in Report No. 65, is interesting, and by no means unlikely. Balādhurī's version differs from Abū Yūsuf's, quoted here in full, in that the former makes the town a stage on Khālīd's march to Syria, which is incorrect,² and says that he left Sa'd in charge there when he continued his journey; otherwise the two stories are the same. There are many instances in history of a subordinate commander detaching himself from the main army and establishing a miniature dynasty in some town or region.

In conclusion, the conquest of 'Iraq can be summarised by saying that once the battle of Qādisiyya was won, it was simply a question of the Muslims occupying the power vacuum left by the Persians. The taxation of the peasants, whether on dihqān-land or State land was organised by 'Umar, and consisted of a poll-tax graded according to class, a land-tax, and certain other

¹T. 2202 ff.

²Musil, 553 ff; Hill, 193-198.

obligations, such as provision of hospitality and advice to the Muslims. A few towns, of which the most important was Ḥīra, made terms with the Muslims before Qādisiyya and these treaties were ratified after that battle. They had to pay only an annual lump-sum tribute, which may, however, have been based upon the number of adult males in the population.

There were no restrictions placed upon the practice of the Christian religion at this time, but some of the dihqāns, who may have been either Christians or Magians, accepted Islam to preserve their privileges and to avoid the humiliation of the poll-tax.

F. South and Central Persia

LIST OF REPORTS

Type A1

1. In year 13, when he was governor of al-Baḥrayn, 'Uthmān b. Abī al-ʿĀṣ conquered Tawwaj, taking prisoners. Y. 151.
2. 'Uthmān b. Abī al-ʿĀṣ raided in Fārs and captured Tawwaj, which he used as a raiding base. He built a mosque there. D. 140 f.
3. Tawwaj was settled by the tribe of 'Abd al-Qays and others. B. 386 (Abū Mikhnaḥ 8).
4. Abū Mūsā conquered all the district of Ahwāz in year 17 except Sūs, Tustar, Rāmḥurmuz, and Manādhīr. B. 376 f (Wāqidi 15 and Abū Mikhnaḥ 3).
5. Ahwāz and Tīrā were conquered 'anwatan by Abū Mūsā after Ahwāz had rebelled. B. 376.
6. Manādhīr was conquered 'anwatan by al-Rabī' b. Ziyād; he killed the garrison and took the children captive. B. 377 f.
7. Abū Mūsā conquered Tustar by force after the Muslims had been guided into the city by a traitor. The marzubān, al-Hurmuzān, took refuge in the citadel, but surrendered, saying he would put himself in the hands of 'Umar. He was sent to Medina under escort. T. 2555 (Sayf 25).
8. In addition to the details given in 7. above, this report says that, on the orders of 'Umar, Abū Mūsā was reinforced in

the siege of Tustar by troops from Kūfa. The governor of Kūfa, 'Ammār b. Yāsir first sent 2,000 men under Jārīr b.

'Abd Allah and Mu'qal b. Muqarrin, and then followed himself with 4,000 men. Qum 297 ff (I.I. 8).

9. This report gives the story of the fall of Tustar, including the reinforcements from Kūfa, the traitor guiding the Muslims into the city, and al-Hurmuzān throwing himself on the mercy of 'Umar. D. 137ff.
10. A similar report on the fall of Tustar. B. 380 f.
11. Tustar, Sūs, and Dawraq were conquered 'anwatan by Abū Mūsà. B. 382 (U 42).
12. Sūs was taken by Abū Mūsà by assault. The dihqān asked for amān for eighty men whom he would name, and this was granted. He omitted his own name from the list and Abū Mūsà had him executed. Qum 295 f (I.I. 8). Virtually the same story in D. 140.
13. After they had rebelled, Abū Mūsà conquered Rāmhurmuz 'anwatan in the last days of his governorship of Baṣra. B. 397 (U 40).
14. 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣ conquered Kāzrūn of Sābūr and its land, and also Nūbandajān. B. 388.
15. Fārs was conquered for the second time by 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣ, when he defeated a rebellion incited and led by Shahrak, a Persian noble. (This report is in the chapter for

- year 23.) T. 2697 f (Sayf 34).
16. Fasā and Darabjird were taken by Sāriya b. Zunaym after a fight. Some booty was taken. (Under year 23.) T. 2700 f (Sayf 25).
 17. Sanbīl was captured by 'Abd Allah b. 'Āmir after they had rebelled. B. 382 (U 42).
 18. Aydhaj was taken by Ibn 'Āmir after a fierce fight. B. 382 (U 42).
 19. Sīnīz was conquered by Abū Mūsā and 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Ās. Its people were left to till the land. B. 388.
 20. Sābūr was conquered by 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Ās in the Caliphate of 'Uthmān. D. 148.
 21. After they had rebelled Sābūr was conquered 'anwatan by Abū Mūsā. B. 388 f.
 22. Sābūr was taken by 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Ās in year 26. Y. 190.
 23. Ibn 'Āmir had to return and reduce Iṣṭakhr after they had rebelled. B. 389.
 24. Al-Kāriyān and Fashajātan were reduced by Ibn 'Āmir; they had not entered into the sulh of al-Harbadh. (See Report No. 69.) B. 389.
 25. Jūr had resisted attacks for some years until it was reduced 'anwatan by Ibn 'Āmir after a fiercely contested siege. B. 389 f.

26. After they had rebelled, Ibn 'Āmir conquered Iṣṭakhr 'anwatan. B. 390 (Abū Mikhnaf 4).
27. Darabjird was reduced by Ibn 'Āmir after a rebellion. B. 390 (Abū Mikhnaf 4).
28. Sābūr, Fasā, Darabjird, and Iṣṭakhr were all conquered by an army sent by Ibn 'Āmir. Y. 192.
29. After the battle of Nihāwand the city of Nihāwand was captured by Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān. Booty was taken and divided and the 'fifth' was sent to Medina, together with the treasure of Kisra. T. 2626 f (Sayf 31). 'Waqidī said that Nihāwand was taken by Jarīr b. Abdallah in yr. 24.' B. 309.
30. Qāshān was conquered by Abū Mūsā by force. (The expression used is 'be jang'.) Qum 78.
31. Abū Mūsā and his commanders conquered the region of Isfahān, including Qumm, by force. 'Some say by sulh, but the most widely known reports say that the conquest was by force.' Qum 25 f (U 60).
32. The lands of Hamadhān were conquered by force (qasran) by Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah. B. 309.
33. Qumm was conquered by Abū Mūsā. (No other details.) B. 312.
34. Qāshān was taken 'anwatan by al-Aḥnaf b. Qays. B. 312.
35. Al-Rayy, Hamadhān, and Isfahān were reduced in year 23. Y. 180.

36. Al-Rayy, after the first conquest by Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān, went on rebelling and being reduced until it was finally conquered by Qaraza b. Ka'b during the governorship of Abū Mūsā over Kūfa, for 'Uthmān. B. 319 (Bakr 7).
37. This report is a bare mention of the conquest of Makrān, with the capture of some booty. T. 2706 f (Sayf 25).
38. Kirmān was conquered by 'Abd Allah b. Budayl in the Caliphate of 'Umar. T. 2704 (Madā'ini 4).
39. Kirmān was conquered by Suhayl b. 'Adī, and he took cattle as booty. T. 2703 f (Sayf 25).
40. The lands of al-Shīrjān were conquered by al-Rabī' b. Ziyād. B. 391.
41. Al-Shīrjān (in Kirmān) was conquered by Mujāshi' b. Mas'ūd, who left a man in charge of the city. B. 391.
42. Having been reduced by al-Rabī' b. Ziyād, Bamm and Andaghār rebelled, and were reconquered by Mujāshi' b. Mas'ūd. B. 391.
43. Jīraft (in Kirmān) was taken 'anwatan by Mujāshi' b. Mas'ūd. B. 391.
44. After taking Zaranj (in Sijistān) Rabī' b. Ziyād went to Khwash, where the people of Bust came out against him. He defeated them after heavy fighting. Prisoners were sent to Medina, and some of these mawālī became famous men in Islam. Sīstān 82 f. See Bosworth 16-17.
45. 'Abd Allah b. Samūra conquered Sijistān for 'Abd Allah b. 'Āmir. Ansāb II, 401.

Type A246. Amān

Bīmāndh (in Kirman) was taken 'anwatan by Mujāshi' b. Nas'ūd, but the inhabitants were given amān. B. 391.

47. When Rabi' b. Ziyād captured Zāliq he took guides from the town to lead him to Zaranj. B. 393 (U 43).

Type A448. Kharāj

Abū Mūsā conquered Ahwāz, taking many prisoners. 'Umar wrote to the Muslims instructing them to release the prisoners and impose the kharāj, as they (the Muslims) had no means for cultivating the land. B. 377 (U 12).

49. Kharāj

When Ahwāz and Iṣṭakhr had been conquered, 'Umar wrote to Abū Mūsā 'impose kharāj as it is imposed on the rest of the land of 'Irāq'. Y. 180.

50. Kharāj

'Abd Allah b. Budayl passed through the plains and mountains of the territory of Isfahān and treated its people as regards kharāj as he had treated the people of Ahwāz'. B. 313.

51. Kharāj

After Isfahān was reduced, the nobles in the castles around the city offered homage, agreeing to pay kharāj, and as they

disdained to pay jizya they became Muslims. B. 313 f
(U 35).

Type A5

52. Jizya; Kharāj.

'It is said that in the first years of the conquest the jizya and kharāj (in Isfahan and its lands) came to 40,000 dirhams; in ancient times the kharāj was twelve million dirhams.' Isf. 49.

53. Jizya; Kharāj.

Having rebelled, al-Rayy was reduced after a siege by Kathīr b. Shihāb. The people submitted to jizya and kharāj. B. 318 (Abū Mikhnaḥ 4).

Type B1

54. Sulh.

When they heard of the victory of Jalūlā', the people of Sūs made a sulh with Abū Mūsā. T. 2562 (Madā'inī 3).

55. Sulh.

The people of Sūs made a sulh with Abū Sabra and al-Nu'mān b. Muqarrin. They entered 'anwatan and then accepted sulh. T. 2565 (Sayf 26).

56. Sulh.

Ahwāz was conquered sulhan by Abū Mūsā. Qum 295. (I.I. 8).

57. Sulh.

Surraq was conquered by Abū Mūsā on the same sulh as Rāmhurmuz. Then they rebelled and were conquered 'anwatan by Ibn 'Āmir. B. 379.

58. Sulh.

Tustar was taken sulhan, then they rebelled and were reconquered. The garrison were killed and their families were taken into captivity, but were released on 'Umar's orders. B. 381 f (U 41).

59. Sulh.

After a siege the king of Sābūr made a sulh with al-Ḥakam b. Abī al-'Āṣ. Al-Ḥakam asked him to help to fight the people of Iṣṭakhr. T. 2698 f (U 58).

60. Sulh.

The people of al-Rayy rebelled and were reconquered sulhan by Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās when he was governor of Kūfa for the second time. This was in year 25. B. 319.

61. Sulh.

Bamm and Andaghār were conquered with sulh by al-Rabī' b. Ziyād. B. 391.

62. Sulh.

Al-Rabī' b. Ziyād made a sulh with the people of Karkūyeh. B. 393.

63. Sulh

Ibn 'Amir made a sulh with the chief of Iṣṭakhr.

B. 389.

Type B264. Sulh; Islam.

The Daylamites asked for sulh and were offered the same terms as Abhar, but they disdained to pay jizya and so became Muslims. Some say that they went to Kūfa and allied themselves with Zuhra b. Ḥawīyya, and others that they stayed where they were, and that their land became tithe land. B. 321 f (Bakr 2).

65. Sulh; 'Ahd.

According to this report, in year 18 the fugitives from Nihāwand were pursued to Hamadhān. A sulh was made with the chief of Hamadhān, and an 'ahd was given. The city later rebelled. T. 2648 f (Sayf 23).

Type B366. Sulh; Tribute.

Al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba went to Ahwāz and after fight he made a sulh with the dihqān, for the payment of a certain sum. B. 376.

67. Sulh; Tribute

Abū Mūsà made a pact (hudna) with the people of Rāmḥurmuz, which they later violated. So he sent Abū Maryam al-Ḥanafī who made a sulh with them on payment of 800,000 dirhams. B. 379.

68. Sulh; Tribute.

Abū Mūsà made a sulh with the people of Rāmḥurmuz on payment of 800,000 or 600,000 dirhams. B. 379 (U 40).

69. Sulh; Tribute.

The chief of Darabjird and Fasa, al-Harbadh, made a sulh with 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣ, agreeing to pay a sum of money. B. 388.

70. Sulh; Tribute.

On the way to Sijistān, al-Rabī' b. Ziyād came to Zāliq where he captured the dihgān during a fight. He made a sulh with al-Rabī', and agreed to ransom his life for gold and silver. B. 392 f (al-Madā'inī 5). See also Sīstān 80 f.

71. Sulh; Tribute.

After fierce fighting the marzubān of Zaranj (in Sijistān) made a sulh with al-Rabī' b. Ziyād, agreeing to give one thousand slaves, each with a golden cup in his hand. This was in year 30. Al-Rabī' stayed in Zaranj, using it as a

base for expeditions. Then Ibn 'Amir came and left a man from the Banū Ḥārith in charge of the city, but the inhabitants expelled him and put the city in a state of defence. The rule of al-Rabī' in Zaranj lasted for two and a half years, during which time he took 40,000 captives. Then Ibn 'Amir appointed 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Samūra to Sijistān, who came to Zaranj and laid siege to the marzubān on their feast day. He made a sulh, agreeing to pay one million dirhams and two thousand slaves. B. 393 f (U 43).

72. Sulh: Tribute.

When al-Rabī' b. Ziyād came to Sīstān in year 30 he fought a fierce engagement in which there were heavy losses on both sides. The Persians then retreated in the city of Zaranj, where the 'Shah' of Sīstān - Īrān b. Rustam - called a council of war, which was attended by the chief priest and other notables. Although they still had strong forces in the city, they agreed that resistance was useless because the divine mission of the Arabs had been foretold in their sacred books. So a sulh was made with al-Rabī'; they agreed to make an annual payment of one million dirhams to the Caliph, together with a gift of one thousand slaves, each with a golden cup in his hand. When 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Samūra

went to Sīstān in year 33 the sulh made between al-Rabī' and Īrān b. Rustam was renewed. Sīstān 81 ff.
See Bosworth 16-17.

Type B4

73. Sulh; Kharāj

This is a brief report saying that a sulh was made with the people of Zaranj, and that kharāj was imposed. T. 2705 (Sayf 25).

Type B5

74. Sulh; Jizya.

After al-Hurmuzān was defeated at Sūq Ahwāz a sulh and jizya was imposed. T. 2541 (Sayf 23).

75. Sulh; Jizya.

Abū Muṣā went to Isfahān and offered them Islam or payment of the jizya. They accepted the latter and a sulh was made; the next morning they rebelled, but were defeated. B. 312 (U 34).

76. Sulh; Jizya; Other conditions

After engaging the king of Isfahān in single combat, 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Itbān made a sulh with him, on payment of the jizya. Those who wished to leave could do so, and their lands then passed into the possession of

the Muslims. Abū Mūsà arrived after the sulh was made. T. 2638 ff (Sayf 23).

Sayf then adds that Abū Mūsà's force came as reinforcements. T. 2640 (Sayf 36).

Type B6.

77. Ṣulḥ; Jizya; Kharāj; Other conditions.

‘Uthmān b. Abī al-‘Ā.s made a sulh with the people of Khurra of Sābūr, for the town and its lands, on payment of the jizya and the kharāj, and on condition that they gave advice to the Muslims. B. 338.

78. Ṣulḥ; Jizya; Kharāj.

At the end of the Caliphate of ‘Umar, Abū Mūsà and ‘Uthmān b. Abī al-‘Ā.s joined their forces in Fars. They conquered Arrajān, making a sulh on payment of the jizya and the kharāj. B. 338.

79. Ṣulḥ; Jizya; Kharāj.

A Persian noble, Dīnār, with his escort, was overtaken by Simāk b. ‘Ubayd. Simāk killed the escort and then engaged Dīnār in single combat. Impressed by Simāk's prowess, Dīnār refused to continue the fight and went with Simāk to ʿUdhayfa b. al-Yamān. He made a sulh with him for the city of Māh, agreeing to pay the jizya, and the kharāj on his lands. T. 2631 (Sayf 32).

Type C180. Sulh; Amān.

After defeating the Persians at Jalūlā' the Muslims advanced to Ḥulwān. As they approached the Persian king, Yazdajird, fled from the city to Isfahān. Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah made a sulh with the people of Ḥulwān on condition that they had amān for their lives and possessions, and that those who wished to leave could do so. He made the same terms with Qarmāsīn. B. 301.

81. Sulh; Amān.

Sūs was besieged by Abū Mūsā. The dihqān said that he would make a sulh and open the gates if Abū Mūsā would grant amān to one hundred men. This was agreed, but the dihqān omitted his own name from the list of one hundred men, and was put to death. B. 378f (See also No. 12 - 'Sulh' and 'Amān' are ambiguous here.)

82. Sulh; Amān.

This is another version of the story of Dīnār given in 79. above. In this report he made the sulh with Ḥudhayfā for Nihāwand. Amān is mentioned but not jizya or kharāj.

83. Sulh; Amān.

Abū Mūsā went to Jundaysābūr, and its inhabitants asked him for amān. He made a sulh with them, agreeing not to

kill or to take captives, and not to despoil them of their possessions. B. 382 (U 41).

85. Sulh; Amān.

After a siege, a sulh was made with the chief of Hamadhān, and amān was granted. T. 2626 (Says 31).

86. Sulh; Amān.

When al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba was over al-Kūfa and Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah over Hamadhān, Jarīr sent al-Barā' b. 'Āzid to Qazwīn. He besieged the fort of Abhar, then after the people of Abhar had asked for amān he made a sulh with them similar to the sulh which Hudhayfa made with Nihāwand. B. 321 (Bakr 2).

Type C3

87. Sulh; Man'a; Dhimma; Tribute; Other conditions; 'Ahd.

This is a report of the sulh of Rāmhumuz between al-Hurmuzmān and Jaz' b. Mu'awiya. The expression man'a is used, indicating protection against external enemies, and the Muslims agreed to go to the aid of al-Hurmuzān if he was attacked by the Kurds. An unspecified tribute was to be paid. The terms dhimma and 'ahd are reported as having been used by 'Umar when discussing this conquest with al-Aḥnaf b. Qays. The surrender also included Tustar,

Sūs, Jundaysābūr, al-Bunyān and Mihrijānqadhaf.

T. 2543 f (Sayf 25).

88. Sulḥ; Amān; Dhimma; Tribute.

The city of Sābūr made some resistance to 'Uthmān b.

Abī al-ʿĀṣ; then the chief of the city, Shahrak, asked for sulḥ and amān, the terms being that a certain sum was paid, that no one was killed or taken captive, and they were given dhimma. This was in year 23 or 24.

Later the city rebelled and was reconquered in year 26 ʿanwatan by Abū Mūsā and Uthmān b. Abī al-ʿĀṣ. B. 388f.

Type C4

89. Sulḥ; Dhimma; Kharāj; Other conditions

Abū Mūsā and 'Uthmān b. Abū al-ʿĀṣ conquered Shīrāz, the terms of the sulḥ being that they became dhimma people and paid the kharāj. Anyone who wished to leave could do so, and there was to be no killing or enslaving. B.388.

Type C5

90. Sulḥ; Man'a.

The people of Dawraq surrendered to Jaz' b. Mu'āwiya without fighting on condition that they were given protection.

T. 2542 f (Sayf 25).

91. Ṣulḥ; Dhimma; Jizya.

'Umar sent 'Abd Allah b. Budayl to Isfahān, whose marzubān was an old man called al-Fādūsafān. The Muslims laid siege to the city but the marzubān found his people lukewarm in their will to resist, so he fled the city hoping to join Yazdajird, with an escort of thirty archers. He was intercepted by Ibn Budayl and fought a single combat with him, but the marzubān broke off the fight and agreed to surrender the city, partly, it seems out of contempt at the cowardice of the inhabitants. The terms were that jizya would be paid, and that they would become dhimma people. B. 312 f (I.I. 1).

92. Ṣulḥ; Dhimma; Jizya (Jizā' in text).

Tawwaj surrendered to Mujāshi' b. Mas'ūd after a battle; this was the second battle of Tawwaj - the first was fought by al-'Alā' b. al-Haḍramī. Spoils were taken and the fifth was sent to Medina. The inhabitants were made dhimma people and the jizya was imposed on them. T. 2695 (Sayf 25).

93. Ṣulḥ; Dhimma; Jizya (Jizā' in text).

After a battle the city of Iṣṭakhr was surrendered to 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣ by the chief of the city, Hirbadh. The Muslims took spoils and sent the fifth to Medina.

The terms of the sulh were that jizya was to be paid and the inhabitants were to become dhimma people.

T. 2696 (Sayf 33).

94. Sulh; Amān; Jizya.

When the people of Jundaysābūr surrendered they did so to a Muslim slave, who accepted their request for amān. The Muslims regarded the word of this slave as binding, like that of any other Muslim. The people became dhimma people and the jizya was imposed. T. 2567 f (Sayf 27).

95. Sulh; Man'a; Jizya (Jizā in text).

'Umar sent Nu'aym b. Muqarrin to Hamadhān, and he besieged the city and took possession of its land. When the people saw this they asked for sulh, which was granted, on condition that they paid the jizya and were given protection. T. 2649 (Sayf 23).

96. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; Other conditions; Sharṭ; Written.

This is the text of the treaty for the surrender of Isfahān, reported in 76. above. From 'Abd Allah to al-Fādhūsān (sic), to the people of Isfahān and its district: jizya is to be paid annually by every adult, for an amount that he can tolerate. The people are to guide the Muslims, advise them, repair the roads, lodge Muslim wayfarers for one day and one night, and provide mounts for foot travellers. They are not to place anyone in authority

over Muslims. They would have no aman if they altered any of the conditions. Anyone who cursed a Muslim would be punished; anyone striking a Muslim would be killed. T. 2640f (Sayf 23).

97. Sulh; Amān; Jizya (Jizā' in text); Other conditions; Sharḥ; Written.

When Nu'aym b. Muqarrin was besieging al-Rayy he was approached by al-Zaynabī, one of the nobles of the city, who was jealous of its ruler. He offered to lead the Muslims into the city by a secret way, and did so. The garrison was killed and booty was taken. The old town of al-Rayy was destroyed and was rebuilt by al-Zaynabī, whose family continued to rule the city thereafter.

The sulh was between Nu'aym and al-Zaynabī for the people of al-Rayy. The treaty was in writing and its terms were as follows: Jizya was to be imposed on every adult annually, for an amount which was tolerable. The people were to guide and advise the Muslims, give hospitality for one night and one day, and show respect to the Muslims. There would be serious consequences for anyone who mocked the Muslims or abused them. The penalty for striking a Muslim would be death. Anyone who altered

the terms would forfeit protection.

The fifth of the booty and the terms of the treaty were sent to 'Umar. T. 2653 ff (Sayf 23).

98. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Dhimma; Jizya; Other conditions; Sharṭ;
Written.

This is a full treaty between the people of Māh Bahrādhān and Nu'aym b. Muqarrin. The jizya was on every adult annually, for himself and his possessions, for an amount which would be tolerable. The amān was for lives, property and lands. They had protection (man'a) if they paid the jizya, but if they acted deceitfully or made changes, the dhimma was void. They had to guide wayfarers, repair the roads, lodge Muslim troops for one day and one night, and give advice to the Muslims. Their religion and their customary laws were not to be interfered with.

The treaty is dated year 19, but the report is in the chapter for year 21. T. 2632 f (Sayf 19).

99. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Dhimma; Jizya; Other conditions; Sharṭ;
Written.

This is a treaty between the people of Māh Dīnār and Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān. The text and the terms are identical to those given in 98. above. T. 2633 (Sayf 19).

100. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj.

This is another version of the story of Dīnār and Simāk, as given in 79. above. In both reports the city in question is Nihāwand; Balādhurī says that it was known (after this event?) as Māh Dīnār. Balādhurī gives the additional information that amān was given to the people of the city of Nihāwand for their possessions, houses, and city walls. B. 305f.

101. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj.

Abū Mūsā led the people of Baṣra to Nihāwand as reinforcements to al-Nu'mān b. Muqarrin. From there he went to Dīnawar, where he besieged the city for five days. Then the people submitted to jizya and kharāj, and asked for amān for their lives, possessions, and children, which was granted. Abū Mūsā left a governor in the city, with a force of cavalry. B. 307.

102. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj.

Then Abū Mūsā went to Masābadhān, where the people, without fighting, made the same ṣulḥ as Dīnawar, agreeing to pay jizya and kharāj. Abū Mūsā sent out expeditions and conquered all its lands. B. 307.

103. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj.

Abū Mūsā sent al-Sā'ib b. al-'Aqra, his son-in-law,

to al-Ṣaymara, the city of Mihrijānqadhaf, and he conquered it sulḥan, the terms being that their lives were spared, no captives were taken, no gold or silver was taken away, provided they paid jizya, and kharāj on the land. He then conquered all the districts of Mihrijānqadhaf. B. 307.

104. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj.

When al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba was 'Umar's 'āmil over al-Kūfa after the dismissal of 'Ammār b. Yāsir, he sent Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah to Hamadhān, and that was in year 23. He fought its people and then conquered it on the same sulḥ as Nihāwand. Then he took possession of its lands by force (gasran). B. 309.

105. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj; Tribute.

When Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās was 'Uthmān's governor over al-Kūfa he appointed al-'Alā' b. Wahb to rule Nihāwand and Hamadhān. The people of Hamadhān had rebelled, and he fought them until they submitted. He made a sulḥ with them, imposing kharāj on their land and jizya on their heads, and they also gave 100,000 dirhams to the Muslims, on condition that their possessions, women, and children were not touched. B. 309 (U 33).

106. Ṣulḥ; Jizya; Kharāj; Amān.

'Umar sent 'Abd Allah b. Budayl to Isfahān in year 23 (or

he told Abū Mūsā to send him). He conquered Jayy (part of Isfahān) after fighting, sulḥan, on condition the people paid jizya and kharāj, giving them amān for their lives and possessions, except for their weapons. B. 312.

107. Sulḥ; Amān; Kharāj; Jizya.

Abd Allah b. Budayl sent al-Aḥnaf b. Qays to Yahūdiyya (another part of Isfahān) and its people made a sulḥ with him on the same terms as Jayy. B. 312.

108. Sulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj.

The people of Sāmaghān and Darābādḥ made a sulḥ with 'Utba b. Ghazwan, agreeing to pay jizya and kharāj on condition that no one was killed or taken captive. They agreed not to block the roads. B. 334 (U 38).

109. Sulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj; Dhimma; Tribute.

'Umar wrote to 'Ammār b. Yāsir, his 'āmil over al-Kūfa, ordering him to send 'Urwa b. Zayd to al-Rayy and Dastabā, which he did. This was two months after the battle of Nihāwand. 'Urwa went there with 8,000 men and won a victory over the Daylamites and the people of al-Rayy, after which he left to take the news of the victory to 'Umar. His place was taken by Salama b. 'Amr, or some say by al-Barā' b. 'Azib, and since the power of the enemy

had been broken by 'Urwa's victory, the local chief, Ibn al-Zaynabī, submitted to the Muslims. He made the sulh on condition that they became dhimmis, paying jizya and kharāj. He also gave, on behalf of the people of al-Rayy and Qūmis, 500,000 (dirhams) on condition that none of them was killed or enslaved, and that no fire-temples were destroyed, and that they were treated for kharāj in the same manner as the people of Nihāwand. He also made a sulh for the people of Dastabā. B. 317 f (Abū Mikhnaḥ 4).

COMMENTARY

(a) Brief Survey of the Conquests.

The conquest of Khuzistān, which is geographically an extension of the 'Irāqī lowlands, was largely the work of Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī with troops from Baṣra, although a force from Kūfa co-operated in the capture of Tustar, the final episode in the campaign.¹ The inhabitants were of Iranian stock and were thus not disposed, as were the Semites of 'Irāq, to yield to the Arabs without a struggle. Their defence was conducted with great energy by the marzubān, al-Hurmuzān, and four years elapsed from the first Arab incursion in 638/17 to the conclusion of the conquest from the fall of Tustar in 642/21. The province was a fertile land with many fortified towns, and the Arabs were handicapped by shortage of siege machines and lack of experience in siege warfare. The conquest was thus a slow progress from strongpoint to strongpoint which were reduced after sieges of varying duration, sometimes terminated by treachery on the part of one of the inhabitants. The Arab armies halted, for the time being, when they reached the mountain barrier of the Zagros.

The conquest of the Iranian plateau, the heartland of the Sasānid Empire was a process which took over a decade to complete. The signal for the beginning of this warfare was the battle of Nihāwand in 642/21.² The Persians, probably at the prompting of

¹B. 376-385; T. 2533- 2543.

²B. 302-307; T. 2506-2633.

King Yazdajird who was then in Fārs, assembled a large army at Nihāwand with forces drawn from all parts of the country. On learning of this the Muslims mobilised an expeditionary force from the warriors of Kūfa with some additional troops from Baṣra, and the overall command was given to Nu'mān b. Muqarrin. The battle which ensued was a complete victory for the Muslims, although Nu'mān himself was killed in the fighting. The immediate sequel to the battle was the mounting of a number of large-scale raids in different directions and under various leaders, although in most cases the complete subjugation of these regions followed some time later. Thus Jibāl was partially conquered in 643/22 by Kūfan troops who had fought at Nihāwand under Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān, the successor of Nu'mān.¹ Rayy, Hamadhān, and Isfahān were conquered for the first time in this period, but had to be subdued again later.² Even the town of Nihāwand itself had to be recaptured in 645.³ The southern part of Jibāl (Media) was conquered by troops from Baṣra under Abū Mūsā, who was governor of the town from 638/17 to 650/29. They took Dīnawar, Masābadhān and Mihrajān-qadhaf, and ranged as far as Qumm and Qashān.⁴

¹B.305-307.

²B.307 ff; T. 2635 ff.

³B.309.

⁴B.307, 312-315.

In 645/24 Abū Mūsā led an army of Basran troops into Fārs, where forces from Baḥrayn under 'Uthmān b. Abī al-ʿĀṣ were already operating. They co-operated in their attempts to subdue Fārs but progress was slow and difficult. Iṣṭakhr was taken in 644/23 but rebelled and was reconquered in 650/29; Sābūr was conquered the first time in 644/23, but then had to be reconquered twice - in 647/26 and 650/29; The year 650/29 saw the appointment of 'Abd Allah b. 'Āmir as governor of Basra, and it was in this year that he completed the conquest of Fārs.¹

The conquest of Sijistān or Sīstān was not thoroughly completed in the period under review. In 652/31 Ibn 'Āmir sent Rabi' b. Ziyād to this province, which he reached by way of Zāliq where he made a treaty with its dihqān. He then arrived at Zaranj, the chief city of the region, and a fierce battle was fought before the enemy forces took refuge behind the city walls. Eventually the chief surrendered, agreeing to pay a tribute in cash and slaves. (From this time on the supply of slaves from Central Asia was to play an increasingly important part in the economy of the Caliphate.) Ziyād remained for over two years in Sīstān, and there was an inter-regnum of about one year after his departure, until Ibn 'Āmir appointed 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Samūra in 653-4/33. It was some years before the province was reconciled to Arab rule, and Arab tenure

¹B. 386-391.

at this time was far from secure.¹

(b) The Termination of Hostilities

Taking first the conquest of Khuzistān this is dealt with in Reports Nos. 4-13, 48, 49, 54-58, 66-68, 74, 81, 84, 87, 90, 94. There is little comment to add to the texts of the A.1 type reports, Nos. 4-13, except to note the unanimity of the sources in ascribing these conquests to Abū Mūsā - when he conquered Manādhir (No. 6) Rabi' b. Ziyād was acting under the orders of Abū Mūsā.

Reports Nos. 48 and 49 show that the peasants in Khuzistān were given the same treatment as those in 'Irāq; since no other details are given, 'kharāj' in this instance can be taken to mean 'tax'. It often has this meaning in Ya'qūbī. Although the 'Irāqī Sawād was occupied without opposition in a few weeks after the battle of Qādisiyya, while the conquest of Khuzistān took four years of heavy fighting, the treatment of the peasants was thus the same in both cases.

The remaining reports present apparent contradictions to those already discussed, since they record voluntary surrender (sulh) instead of conquest by force. This situation is common in the accounts of the conquests in the Iranian lands, and reflects the difficulties encountered during these campaigns. The

¹B. 393 f; Sīstān 81 ff.

region was hostile to the Arabs and the people were of a war-like disposition, but they lacked a central authority to co-ordinate their efforts. The Arabs, for their part, although they were generally well led, had neither the means nor the experience for conducting full-scale sieges, nor could they spare the men to station adequate garrisons in the places they had conquered. A town might be captured by assault after a long and difficult siege, or the inhabitants might agree to surrender on terms, only to expel the small garrison and close the gates once the main Muslim army had moved on elsewhere. The point is perhaps best explained by considering the conquest of the main cities in some detail. For Ahwāz, Report No. 4 says that all the districts of Ahwāz were conquered by Abū Mūsā in A.H. 17, except Sūs, Tustar, Rāmḥurmuz, and Manādhīr. This was the first year of the invasion of Khuzistān, and the report indicates that Abū Mūsā penetrated to Ahwāz, where he made a temporary treaty, but not to the other cities lying in the foothills of the Zagros. Report No. 56 says that the city was conquered sulḥan by Abū Mūsā, while No. 5 says that it was taken 'anwatan after they had rebelled. No. 66 does not refer to this period at all, but probably holds the memory of a raiding expedition by al-Mughīra a year or two earlier, when he briefly held the governorship of Baṣra. No. 74, however, almost certainly refers to the final conquest of the city, since al-Hurmuzān was conducting the defence. It seems

reasonable to infer that Abū Mūsā made an exploratory raid in A.H. 17 and placed Ahwāz under tribute, returning after this to Baṣra. Later, perhaps in the following year, he returned, by which time al-Hurmuzān had organised the defence of the province. Al-Hurmuzān was defeated in battle near Ahwāz, and the city then surrendered again, this time permanently. Report No. 74 says that jizya was imposed and that there was a sulh, whereas Nos. 48 and 49, without mentioning sulh, say that 'Umar imposed kharāj, and in both cases the terms probably mean that some form of tax was laid upon the city. It is clear that 'Umar recognised the practical impossibility of treating these towns in any other way - once again the futility of the sulhan versus 'anwatan argument is demonstrated.

The case of Sūs is similar. Report No. 55 appears to be contradicted by No. 4, since the former tells us that the city made a sulh after Jalūlā', while the latter says that Sūs was not conquered in A.H. 17. If, therefore, Abū Mūsā advanced as far as Sūs in that year, which is unlikely, the agreement must have been of an ephemeral nature. Reports Nos. 11, 12, 55 and 81 tell virtually the same story with varying amounts of detail. The anecdote of the dihqān who omitted his own name from the list of those granted aman (Nos. 12 and 81), is probably apocryphal, invented to excuse some execution that was felt to be unlawful,

but the city was obviously not taken by assault, but either by surrender or through treachery. Afterwards a tax was probably levied as at Ahwāz, but we have no information. Report No. 55, from Sayf b. 'Umar can be accepted, if the name of Abū Mūsā is substituted for the names given by Sayf. It is noteworthy that none of the reports says that Sūs rebelled, so it can be assumed that no earlier conquest, in the real sense, had taken place.

The reports for Tustar, Nos. 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 58, are straightforward. No. 4 merely says that the city was not conquered in A.H. 17, while No. 58 is probably in error when stating that the city had rebelled, having confused the story of Tustar with that of some other town. Nos. 7, 8, 9 and 10 give basically the same account of the conquest, and make it clear that this took place in A.H. 21, since 'Ammār b. Yāsir was governor of Kūfa in that year. That the entry was effected through the treachery of a citizen is quite probable, the Muslims at this time being ineffectual in siege warfare. The fall of Tustar, and the capture of al-Hurmuzān, marked the end of serious resistance in Khuzistān.

Finally the conquest of Rāmhurmuz - Reports Nos. 4, 13, 67, 68 and 87 - was probably first achieved in about A.H. 20, before the fall of Tustar. According to Report No. 13 they then rebelled some years later, in A.H. 28 or 29, and were reconquered by a

lieutenant of Abū Mūsā, Abū Maryam al-Ḥanafī, as stated in Report No. 67. It is significant that the expression hudna is used for the first agreement as this expression is usually applied to treaties made between equal partners - e.g. in Nubia. The sulh mentioned in Reports Nos. 67 and 68 applies to the second conquest, when the tribute of 600,000 or 800,000 dirhams was imposed. Report No. 87 though unreliable in most of its details also mentions that a tribute was imposed. The provision of the actual amount to be paid is rare in the reports for the Persian campaign, but the imposition of a fixed tribute is a common feature in the surrender terms for towns and cities in the Iranian lands. Report No. 87 supports the statement that tribute was levied at Rāmḥurmuz, but is otherwise suspect. Jaz' b. Mu'āwiya was not the leader who conquered Khuzistān, but was a subordinate of Abū Mūsā.¹ Nor is it likely that a surrender was arranged with al-Ḥurmuzān at this city, a sulh which embraced other important cities, when it is beyond doubt that he made his forced submission at Tustar and was then sent as a captive to Medina.

The conquest of Khuzistān was thus lengthy and difficult, and its defence was conducted with tenacity by al-Ḥurmuzān. The Muslims could never be sure that a city which had seemingly been

¹B. 385.

conquered would not break the contract that it had reluctantly accepted. Only the slow attrition of prolonged warfare, and finally the capture of their leader, compelled the people of the province to accept Muslim rule. The same situation arose in all the Iranian lands, in Armenia, and in Khurāsān.

Because the narratives for the conquest of Fārs are extremely confused, and because the campaigns showed the same pattern of capture-rebellion-recapture as those in Khuzistān but over a longer period, it is a very difficult task to unravel the strands of the story. The following outline of events should be borne in mind:

1. In 635/14 al-'Alā' b. al-Haḍramī when governor of Baḥrayn launched an unsuccessful attack against Fārs.
2. Al-'Alā' was succeeded as governor of Baḥrayn by 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣ, who sent his brother al-Ḥakam across the Persian Gulf to invade Fārs in 640/19. He went himself to Fārs shortly after this and for six or seven years he waged a series of campaigns against the province, with fluctuating fortunes.
3. Abū Mūsā moved into Fārs in 644/23 and joined forces with 'Uthmān. The slow conquest of the province continued.
4. In 649/29, after he had replaced Abū Mūsā as governor of Baḥrayn, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Āmir completed the subjugation of Fārs.

The reports for Fārs, subdivided into towns, are as follows:

Nos. 1, 2, 3, 92 - Tawwaj; 14, 20, 21, 22, 28, 59, 77, 88 - Sābūr; 23, 26, 28, 63, 93 - Iṣṭakhr; 16, 28, 69 - Fasa; 16, 27, 28, 69 - Darabjird; 89 - Shīrāz; 15, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 78 - other places. As with Khuzistān, it is hoped that a consideration of the conquest of some of the main cities will help to clarify the history of the subjugation of the whole province, and demonstrate the manner in which hostilities were terminated. For Tawwaj, the position seems to have been that it was reached by al-'Alā' in his raid, and was then captured by 'Uthmān, and made into a garrison town and expeditionary base. Report No. 1 is an account of the early raid, although it makes the error of attributing this to 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣ. Ya'qūbi does, however, introduce al-'Alā' b. al-Ḥaḍramī into his narrative as a subordinate of 'Uthmān. Reports Nos. 2 and 3 describe 'Uthmān's occupation of the town, without giving details of any terms imposed on the inhabitants. Report No. 92 gives the leader in the second capture of the town as Mujāshi' b. Mas'ūd, not Uthmān; it is possible that Mujāshi' took part in this conquest in the role of a subordinate, since he was operating in the region of Kirmān a few years later (see, for instance, Report No. 42). Otherwise the report seems acceptable; undoubtedly some booty would have been taken, and some sort of tribute exacted from the inhabitants. No 'rebellion' is mentioned in Tawwaj after its conquest by 'Uthmān, so it appears to have remained in

Muslim hands from that time onwards.

Report No. 15 gives an account of the 'rebellion' led by Shahrak, a Persian noble, and is taken from the detailed narrative in Ṭabarī. The ensuing battle seems to have been a desperate affair, but 'Uthmān b. Abī al-ʿĀṣ was finally victorious. If one then refers to Report No. 88, giving Balādhurī's account of the fall of Sābūr, one finds confirmation of Sayf b. 'Umar's version. Apparently the resistance of Shahrak was centred on Sābūr, and his defeat led to the surrender of Sābūr, the granting of aman, and the levying of a tribute. (The writer has so far avoided any discussion of the use of the term 'dhimma' in reports on these early conquests. The question has been deferred until Section V of this work.) This agreement did not last, because Report No. 88 goes on to say that the city had to be reconquered by 'Uthmān and Abū Mūsā in A.H. 26. This is confirmed by Reports Nos. 21 and 22, although the former mentions only Abū Mūsā and the latter only 'Uthmān. No. 22, from Ya'qūbī, corroborates Balādhurī's date of A.H. 26 for the second conquest. Reports Nos. 14, 20, 59 and 77 all apparently refer to the first surrender, although No. 59 may be in error in making al-Ḥakam the negotiator, unless his brother had delegated this duty to him. It is interesting that Nos. 59 and 77 both indicate that the Muslims were trying to enlist the co-operation of the Persians against their fellow countrymen. This was probably unsuccessful, as Sābūr seems

to have rebelled twice, and to have been finally reduced by Ibn 'Āmir, as stated in Report No. 28. The terms that were imposed after this permanent conquest are not given, but the payment of tribute was probably renewed, together with a land-tax. The mention of both jizya and kharāj in Report No. 77 indicates that there were two distinct methods of taxation. This report refers to the first conquest, but may be describing the fiscal terms which applied a few years later.

Iṣṭakhr made some kind of treaty with 'Uthmān, the Persian leader being a noble called Hirbadh or Harbadh. Report No. 93 mentions this sulh and says that the jizya was imposed, which again may mean some form of tribute. Reports Nos. 23, 26, 28 and 63 all state that the city had to be reconquered by Ibn 'Āmir, although the first two of these specify that the city had rebelled, while No. 63 says that he made a sulh with the chief of Iṣṭakhr - perhaps this is a confusion with the earlier surrender.

According to Balādhurī, Harbadh made the sulh for Fasā and Darabjird, not for Iṣṭakhr - see Report No. 69 - but again the terms included the payment of tribute. Reports Nos. 27 and 28 say that these two towns had to be reconquered by Ibn 'Āmir. Report No. 16 may have the date of the first conquest of Fasā and Darabjird correct, but not the name of the Muslim leader.

Unlike some of the other towns, Jūr seems to have resisted all attempts to conquer it, according to Report No. 25, and to have

been conquered only once, by Ibn 'Āmir.

Much time and ingenuity could be devoted to examining these reports, in the hope of arriving at a definitive history of the conquest of Fārs, but it seems unlikely that one could ever eliminate the element of uncertainty. The above discussion gives an indication of the course of events, but may be incorrect in details - one 'rebellion' too many here, one too few there. It can only be said for certain that resistance was stubborn and protracted, that the Muslim armies were unused to operating in difficult mountain terrain, and too small in numbers to garrison the cities and countryside which they had temporarily conquered. This was the cradle of the Persian race and the centre of their religion, a province that they were not prepared to cede without a struggle. Once the Muslim armies, having exacted a temporary submission, had moved out of an area, the people repaired their defences and prepared to continue their resistance. It is likely that Ibn 'Āmir was in command of considerably larger forces than his predecessors, since the population of the 'Irāqī towns had been expanding for some years as a steady stream of immigrants came into them from Arabia, with more and more fighting men available to swell the Muslim armies. On the other hand, ten years of warfare must have worn down the resources of the Persians, who had no means for replacing their losses. Thus, although Ibn 'Āmir arrived

with fresh forces and made a speedy end to the conquest, the real credit for the reduction of Fārs must go to 'Uthmān b. Abi al-'Āṣ and Abū Mūsā, who in years of persistent warfare had destroyed the power and the will of their enemy. Information on the actual surrender terms in Fārs is very scanty. Tribute is mentioned (Nos. 69, 88), jizya (Nos. 92, 93), kharāj (No. 98), and the two latter terms occur together in some reports (e.g. Nos. 77, 78). The method of payment and the amounts levied, however, are not stated. Elaborate treaty texts are not quoted and references to other conditions such as the provision of hospitality, the upkeep of roads and bridges, and religious restrictions do not occur. There are only two brief references to the requirement to give aid or advice to the Muslims - in Nos. 59, 77. The fact that surrenders were negotiated with chiefs, e.g. Shahrak and Harbadh, reflects the hierarchical system prevailing in the province.

The province of Jibāl or Media covers the central Zagros from the latitude of Isfahān in the south to the latitude of Rayy, modern Teherān, in the north; it is bounded to the west by the plains of 'Irāq, and to the east by the Central Desert. In a way the story of the conquest of Jibāl is even more complicated than that of Fārs. It is a larger region and there were more Muslim commanders involved in the campaigns, while the same difficulties of terrain and of stubborn resistance were encountered. The conquest began after the battle of Nihāwand in 642/21, when

the Muslim forces under various leaders spread out in different directions, as much in search of booty as intent upon the permanent subjugation of the province. These expeditions did, however, develop into a war of conquest and, as in Fārs and Khuzistān, the cities usually had to be reduced at least twice before they submitted finally to Muslim rule. This has caused a similar confusion in the sources as was found for the other Persian provinces.

The reports which concern Jibāl are as follows: 31, 35, 50, 51, 52, 75, 76, 91, 96, 106, 107, - Isfahān; 29, 79, 82, 99, 100, - Nihāwand; 35, 36, 53, 60, 97, 99, 109, - Rayy; 32, 35, 65, 85, 95, 104, 105, - Hamadhān; 31, 33, - Qumm; 30, 34, - Qāshān; 64, 80, 83, 86, 98, 101, 103, 108, - other places.

A glance at the map will reveal the strategic importance of Isfahān. It is the junction for all the main routes in Persia: from the Gulf and from Fārs in the south; from 'Irāq in the east; from Adharbayjān and from Khurāsān via Rayy in the north. The significance of the city was emphasised by al-Hurmuzān when 'Umar asked him where to begin the conquest, with Adharbayjān or with Isfahān. 'Isfahān is the head' he said 'and Adharbayjān the wings; cut off the head and both wings and head will fall.'¹ Isfahān was one of the main objectives of the Muslims once they had crossed the Zagros and defeated the Persians at Nihāwand, and the importance attached to its capture is reflected in the

¹B. 303.

number of traditions concerning this city. Two years, however, were to pass before the city fell into Muslims hands, if the statements of Balādhurī and Ya'qūbī are to be accepted, that the conquest was in year 23. Ṭabarī, quoting Sayf b. 'Umar, gives the report in his chapter for year 21, but then the same authority antedated the battle of Nihāwand by about four years. The key figure in this event was Abū Mūsà, whom all the writers mention as having been concerned in the conquest of Isfahān, although Sayf says that he arrived after the city had surrendered to 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Itbān, a Kūfan (Reports Nos. 76 and 96). Balādhurī says that after the battle of Nihāwand Abū Mūsà returned to Ahwāz, and then came back and conquered Qumm. He goes on to say that in year 23 'Umar ordered 'Abd Allah b. Budayl to go against Isfahān, or that 'Umar told Abū Mūsà to send 'Abd Allah.¹ Now Abū Mūsà was in Fārs in year 23, before the death of 'Umar - he had been raiding Fārs from Baṣra but moved into that province to conduct a full-scale campaign with 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣ.² So it is probable that it was 'Abd Allah b. Budayl, under Abū Mūsà's orders, and not Abū Mūsà himself, who

¹B. 312.

²B. 387; see E.I., 'al-Ash'arī' 695.

made the conquest of Isfahān. This appears to have been the first and only capture of the city, since there are no references to other conquests, or to the inhabitants having rebelled. The Muslims, knowing the strategic value of the city, and its significance as a stage on the 'silk' route to Central Asia and beyond, probably took care to station an adequate garrison as soon as it had been captured.

There seems to be no reason to doubt that a proper treaty was drawn up for Isfahān soon after its capture, and the details given by Sayf in Report No. 96 are quite credible. The jizya here is clearly a poll-tax, and this is supported by other reports which mention jizya and kharāj as separate taxes, e.g. Nos. 52 and 106, and No. 50 indicates that kharāj applied to the land. The other conditions given in No. 96 are just those which it would have been necessary to insist on for the population of a garrison city, especially when much of the region was still hostile. Guiding, advising and billeting the Muslims, and providing mounts for foot travellers would all ensure that the city was an adequate base for the military operations. The prohibition against placing anyone in authority over the Muslims, and the penalties for cursing or striking Muslims were necessary to maintain the ascendancy of the conquerors. 'It must be emphasised that this type of treaty is quite different from those which specify various humiliating restrictions and prohibitions

for docile Christian populations, although there are superficial similarities. Where the latter type of treaty is reported, especially in regions which were totally subjugated, it can be assumed that they are not authentic, and reflect the intolerance and the jurisprudential opinions of a later period. The terms of this treaty for Isfahān, and others like it, were a necessity for maintaining order and Muslim rule in a potentially hostile environment. Finally, Report No. 51 records another early example of the Persian nobility having accepted Islam to avoid paying the poll-tax, and also, doubtless to preserve a large measure of autonomy.

The history of the conquest of Rayy, despite some confusion in the sources, is really quite straightforward, because several of the reports can be dated. The key is given by Report No. 36, which states that Rayy was continually rebelling and being reconquered until it was finally conquered when Abū Mūsā was governor of Kūfa for 'Uthmān. This was in 654-5/34,¹ and indeed several of the earlier conquests can be found in the other reports. Nos. 97 and 109 refer to the same event, although they name different Muslim leaders - this may merely mean that Nu'aym b. Muqarrin was in command over the whole army, while 'Urwa b. Zayd took the submission of Rayy. This conquest is dated by the information that it was two months after Nihāwand while 'Ammār b. Yāsir was governor

¹E.I., 'al-Ash'arī' 695.

of Kūfa, i.e. in 642/21.¹ The next conquest was that mentioned in Report No. 53, which is from the same tradition of Abū Mikhnaḥ as No. 109. He says that this occurred when al-Mughīra had replaced 'Ammār b. Yāsir in Kūfa, so this was probably in the next year, 643/22.² Report No. 60 refers to a conquest when Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās was 'Uthmān's governor over Kūfa, which was in 645/25.³ It seems, therefore, that Report No. 36, which is from a local source, is fully supported by the Kūfan traditions and that Rayy offered prolonged resistance to the Muslims. Almost certainly this was because of the proximity of the city to the mountains, inhabited by the warlike Daylamites.⁴

The terms made with al-Zaynabī are similar to those quoted for Isfahān, although those in No. 97 are noticeably more severe than those in No. 109. It is likely that both of these reports embody terms that were offered at different times during the attempts to subdue the city. No. 97 may give the closest version to the truth, while the mention of a tribute in No. 109 probably does refer to the first conquest.

The reports for other cities follow a similar pattern. Thus, using the same method for dating, Hamadhān was conquered in 642/21 (Nos. 95 and 65), in 644/23 (Nos. 35 and 104), and finally in 645/25 (No. 105). For Nihāwand all the reports except the

¹Ca. Chron. 21/1 & 3.

²Ca. Chron. 22/2.

³Ca. Chron. 25/6.

⁴Report No. 64; B. 318.

second part of No. 29 give only the first conquest, after the battle, in 642/21, but the statement from Wāqidi, in Report No. 29, indicates that they must have rebelled, as they had to be reconquered in 645/24.

In some ways the conquest of Jibāl was similar to that of Fārs, although it was less protracted; with the exception of Rayy it was completed by 645/25. Otherwise there was the same pattern of conquest, rebellion, and reconquest. At least four of the major cities were surrendered by their chiefs - Isfahān (No. 96), Rayy (No. 97), Nihāwand (No. 79), Hamadhān (No. 85), which indicates that defeat in battle had not dislodged the nobility from their position.

The treaty terms quoted for Jibāl, however, do differ from those given for Fārs, and for Khuzistān. Indeed, for the whole of southern and central Persia, the treaties for Jibāl are the most comprehensive. All the treaties in Reports Nos. 95-109 are for this province, and contain the conditions sulh, aman and jizya, while Nos. 100-109 have kharāj in addition. No. 96 for Isfahān has already been discussed, and Nos. 97, 98, and 99 are similar to this. These are all from Sayf b. 'Umar, but those from Balādhuri do not vary greatly from them, except that they omit the conditions for assistance and the penalties for offences against Muslims. The strategic and economic importance of the region doubtless made it necessary for the Muslims to draft

the surrender terms more carefully than in other areas of Persia. For there is no likelihood that the conquest of Jibāl was easier in any way, and the term sulh, when used in the reports cannot mean 'voluntary surrender' - it is significant that the 'Tārīkh-i-Qumm' says that the conquests of Qumm and Qāshān were by force (Reports Nos. 30,31).

The mention of jizya and kharāj, as has been noted, is common. When the two terms occur together it is a reasonable assumption that they are meant as poll-tax and land-tax respectively, and sometimes these meanings are specified: jizya in Nos. 96, 97; kharāj in Nos. 79, 103.

The other reports in this section concern the lands east of Fārs and south of the Central Desert, as far as Sijistan or Sīstān, which is equivalent to the western part of modern Afghanistan. The mention of Makrān in Report No. 37 as having been conquered in A.H. 23 is certainly an error. Makrān is the province on the Indian Ocean west of modern Pakistan, and there would have been no possibility of mounting an expedition into this inhospitable region until Fārs was completely subdued. Balādhurī says that the first expedition was when Ziyād b. Abī Sufyān ruled 'Irāq in the time of Mu'awiya, and this date is much more likely.

For the period under review there is very little information on Kirmān, the province immediately to the east of Fārs - less

than one page in Balādhurī and some brief references in Ṭabarī. The relevant reports are Nos. 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46 and 61. The conquests mentioned by al-Madā'inī (No. 38), by Sayf b. 'Umar (No. 39), and by Balādhurī (Nos. 40 and 61), were obviously little more than raids carried out during the years when the Muslims were engaged in the slow conquest of Fārs. Apart from booty they probably had as objective the intention of deterring the people of Kirmān from sending reinforcements into Fārs. The other reports - Nos. 41, 42, 43, 46 - are all from Balādhurī, and concern the invasion of Mujāshi' b. Mas'ūd, who was detached from Ibn 'Amir's army which was advancing to Khurāsān in 651/30.¹ There is little information; the comment in Report No. 41 that a man was left in charge of Shīrjān after it was captured indicates that the Muslims left garrisons, and hence that they intended the conquest to be permanent.

The reports on Sīstān are Nos. 44, 45, 47, 62, 70, 71, 72, 73. All except one of these - No. 45 - are concerned with the conquest of Rabi' b. Ziyad, who was sent there by Ibn 'Amir in 651/30, when the latter was leading his army to Khurāsān. Nos. 47 and 70 refer to Zāliq, a stage on his route, where he took guides and put the town under tribute, and No. 62 mentions another town on his route.

¹B. 391.

Resistance to the Muslims centred on Zaranj, the main city of Sīstān and the chief sources of information for its conquest are Reports Nos. 71 and 72. The main purpose of this expedition seems to have been the acquisition of booty and slaves, and the first occupation was not permanent, since Report No. 71 says that the Muslims were expelled after the departure of Rabī'. As these reports, and No. 45, mention, the province was again invaded in 653-4/33, by a Muslim army under the command of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Samūra, but the Muslim hold on Sīstān remained insecure for many years to come.¹

There is very little precise information on the fiscal conditions that were imposed by the Muslims in South and Central Persia. The terms jizya and kharāj are frequently used, and they often appear together, which indicates that two distinct taxes were levied. Sometimes the reports specify that the kharāj was a land-tax (e.g. Nos. 79, 103, 104), and others say that the jizya was levied on every adult (e.g. Nos. 96, 98), but nowhere are the rates of taxation given. The imposition of a fixed tribute is mentioned for other places, e.g. in Reports Nos. 67, 69, 87, 88.

In Fārs, Jibāl and Khuzistān the general method of taxation seems to have been by the collection of a poll-tax and a land-tax.

¹See Bosworth 16-18.

although there were probably variations from one region to another. The system of payment by fixed tribute may have continued for individual cities, particularly where local governors were strong enough to keep the responsibility for taxation in their own hands. The position in Sistān was similar to that in Khurāsān, where a fixed tribute was agreed with the ruler, who was responsible for collecting it and delivering it to the Muslims.

Difficult terrain, tenacious opponents, and Muslim incompetence in siege warfare made these campaigns very different from the easy occupations of Syria, 'Irāq and Egypt. In the early years the Muslim armies were too small to garrison the country effectively after local successes had been won. Only the arrival of fresh waves of immigrants, which increased the size of the Muslim armies, enabled them to make the final subjugation of the provinces of Fārs and Jibāl. It was not until 651/30 that the advance to the north and east could continue under Ibn 'Amir, but the conquest of these regions was not completed for many years.

G. North Persia

LIST OF REPORTSType A1

1. Adharbayjān was conquered in year 22. Y.180.
2. Herāt was conquered 'anwatan by al-Aḥnaf b. Qays. He left an 'amil in charge of the city. T. 2682 (Sayf 25).
3. Al-Aḥnaf conquered Marw al-Shāhijān, leaving an 'amil, and he reduced Marw al-Rūdh. After a battle with the forces of Yazdajird, he conquered Balkh. T. 2683 (Sayf 25).
4. After the death of Yazdajird, the Arabs, led by the Imām Ḥasan b. 'Alī, Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān, and others, advanced to Āmul (in Ṭabaristān). MH 98.
5. 'Umar dismissed Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān from Adharbayjān and appointed 'Uṭba b. Farqad, who went to Ardabil where he found the people fulfilling their 'ahd. The (town of ?) Nuwāḥ, however, had violated it, so he fought against them, conquered and took booty. B. 326.
6. Abū Mūsā sent 'Abd Allah b. Budayl (to Khurāsān) and he came to al-Ṭabasayn which is two forts and the gates of Khurāsān. He took booty there. Others say that 'Abd Allah went there from Isfahān of his own accord. B. 403.
7. When 'Abd Allah. b 'Āmir raided Khurāsān in year 30 he sent al-Aḥnaf b. Qays to Qūhistān, where he found the people called al-Hayāṭala. He defeated them and conquered Qūhistān 'anwatan. B. 403.

8. Ibn 'Āmir sent Abū Sālīm b. Yazīd to the district of Nīshāpūr; he conquered Zām 'anwatan, and he also conquered Bākhraz. Then he went to Khuwayn, which he reduced, taking captives. B. 403 f.
9. Ibn 'Āmir sent al-Aswad b. Kulthūm to Bayhaq, another dependency of Nīshāpūr, which he conquered. (He was killed in the assault on the town, and his brother took over the command.) B. 404.
10. The following dependencies of Nīshāpūr were reduced by Ibn 'Āmir: Busht; Ashband; Rukhkh; Zāwa; Khuwāf; Asbarā'in; Arghiyān. B. 404.
11. Ibn 'Āmir conquered Tāghūn and Bāghūn 'anwatan. B. 405.
12. After a siege, Ibn 'Āmir took Nīshāpūr 'anwatan. Y. 192.
13. In the days when Ziyād b. Abihi was governor of 'Irāq for Mu'āwiya, Sa'īd b. 'Uthmān was appointed to rule Khurāsān. He went to Nīshāpūr, where he found a colony of Arabs from the days of Ibn 'Āmir. Ibn A'tham 337.
14. Al-Aḥnaf b. Qays conquered Marw al-Rūdh 'anwatan. Y. 193.
15. Ibn 'Āmir sent out various lieutenants, who conquered Herāt, Marw al-Rūdh, and Sarakhs, all without sulh. Y. 193.
16. Ibn 'Āmir conquered Nīshāpūr 'anwatan; also Tūs, Bīward, Nasā; and Humrān. T. 2887 (Madā'in'i 9.)

17. This report is a bare mention of the conquest, by Ibn 'Amir, of Sarakhs, Kirmān, and Sijistān. D.149.
18. Herāt and Bādghīs were conquered by a lieutenant of Ibn 'Amir; later they rebelled and joined the enemy. T. 2904 (Madā'inī 13).
19. Marw al-Rūdh was reconquered by al-Aḥnaf b. Qays after they had rebelled. T. 2907 (Wāqidī 1).
20. Ibn 'Amir conquered Khurāsān when he ruled Baṣra for 'Uthmān. Ansāb II, 402.
21. A force under Shubayl b. 'Awf, sent out by al-Walīd b. 'Uqba, reduced Mūqān and al-Babar, taking booty and prisoners. T. 2805 (Abū Mikhnaf 6).
22. Al-Walīd b. 'Uqba raided Adharbayjān in year 25. The people had rebelled, and he attacked the people of Mūqān, al-Babar, and al-Ṭaylasān, taking booty and prisoners. B. 327 (Madā'inī 1).
23. 'Sa'īd b. al-'Āṣ raided the people of Adharbayjān and attacked the people of Mūqān and Jīlān. A number of Armenians and people of Adharbayjān assembled against him in the region of [text uncertain], and he sent Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah against them and he defeated them' B. 328 f (U 87).

Type A3.

24. Tribute.
Sa'īd b. al-'Āṣ raided Ṭabaristān and al-Rūyān (?), and

Darbāwand (Damāvand?) in year 29. The people of the mountains gave him money - the Muslims were raiding Ṭabaristān and its adjacent areas - 'and perhaps they gave him the tribute (itāwa) so that they would not be attacked, or perhaps it was after fighting'. B.335.

Type A4.

25. Kharāj.

'Al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba raided Adharbayjān from al-Kūfa in year 22, conquered it and imposed kharāj.' B. 326 (Wāqidi 1).

Type B1

26. Al-Aḥnaf b. Qays made a sulh with the people of Khurāsān, in places between Nīshāpūr and Ṭukhāristān, and he left an 'amil over Ṭukhāristān. T. 2683 (Sayf 25).

27. Sulh.

The cavalry of al-Aḥnaf came to a place called Baghgh, and drove off some cattle; the sulh was made after that.
B. 406.

28. Sulh.

Al-Aḥnaf took al-Ṭāḡān sulhan. B. 407.

29. Sulh.

After a siege Ibn 'Āmir took Abarshahr, i.e. Nīshāpūr, by sulh. Y. 192.

30. Sulh.

In year 33 Ibn 'Amir took Nīshāpūr sulhan after they had revolted. On the same expedition al-Aḥnaf went to Marw al-Shāhijān, which had also rebelled, and conquered it sulhan. T. 2907 (Wāqidī 1).

31. Sulh.

Sa'id b. al-'Āṣ made the same sulh with Qūmis as Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān made after Nihāwand. T. 2836 (Madā'inī 6).

32. Sulh.

Sa'id b. al-'Āṣ made a sulh with the people of Jurjān; then they rebelled, and for years no one could use that route to Khurāsān. T. 2893 (Madā'inī 7).

Type B333. Sulh; Tribute.

Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān raided Jīlān and Mūqān, defeated them, and made a sulh for the payment of a tribute (itāwa).

B. 326 (U 36).

34. Sulh; Tribute; Written.

(The following statement, and 6. above, are part of the same report) 'Some of the people of al-Ṭabasayn came to 'Umar, and made a sulh with him for 60,000, or some say 75,000 [dirhams], and he wrote them a statement to that effect.' B. 403.

35. Sulh; Tribute.

When al-Walīd b. 'Uqba went to Adharbayjān in year 24, the people paid 800,000 dirhams, which was agreed in the sulh made in year 22 with Hudhayfa b. al-Yamān. Payment had been withheld, but was now made once more. T. 2805 f (Abū Mikhnaf 6).

36. Sulh; Tribute.

'Sa'id b. al-'Ās made a sulh with the king of Jurjān, for the payment of 100,000, some say 300,000, baghliyya [?]. B. 334 f.

37. Sulh; Tribute.

When Ibn 'Āmir came to al-Ṭabasayn in year 30 he confirmed the sulh made in the time of 'Umar (see 6. and 34. above). B. 403.

38. Sulh; Tribute.

When Ibn 'Āmir went to Baṣra he left 'Abd Allah b. Ṭāhir in charge of Nīshāpūr. He wished to take kharāj from them, amounting to one quarter of the produce, but the Persian leader objected, saying that it was sulhan, and that it was illegal to take kharāj from places taken by sulh.

He threatened to let war decide between them unless 'Abd Allah changed his mind. Finally a fixed tribute was agreed upon. Al-Nīshābūrī comments: 'from these stories it is clear

that Nīshāpūr was taken by sulh, not by force (jang)'.

Nīsh. 130.

39. Sulh; Tribute.

(This follows on from the version in 7. above): 'or, rather, it is said that al-Aḥnaf besieged them in their fortress, and that Ibn 'Āmir caught up with him, and they asked for sulh from Ibn 'Āmir, which he granted on the payment of 600,000 dirhams'. B. 403.

40. Sulh; Tribute.

The chief of Nasā came to 'Abd Allah b. Khāzim, a lieutenant of Ibn 'Āmir, and made a sulh with him for 300,000 dirhams. The chief of Abīward came to Ibn 'Āmir and made a sulh with him for 400,000 dirhams. B.404.

41. Sulh; Tribute.

The marzubān of Tūs made a sulh with Ibn 'Āmir for 600,000 dirhams. AU 147. Identical details in B. 405.

42. Sulh; Tribute.

After fighting with the people of Herāt, Bādghīs, and Būshanj, Ibn 'Āmir made a sulh with their marzubān for one million dirhams. B. 405.

43. Sulh; Tribute; Hospitality.

'The marzubān of Marw al-Shāhijān sent a message to Ibn 'Āmir, asking for sulh. Ibn 'Āmir sent Ḥātim b. Nu'mān

and he made a sulh with him for 2,200,000 dirhams, or some say 1,00,000 dirhams and 200,000 jaribs of wheat and barley. ...' They had to entertain the Muslims in their homes, and it was their responsibility to assess the people for taxation; the Muslims then received the total sum.

B. 405 f.

44. Sulh: Tribute; Other conditions.

Al-Aḥnaf b. Qays besieged the fort known as Qaṣr al-Aḥnaf, which had an extensive territory attached to it. The people made a sulh with him, agreeing to pay 300,000 (dirhams). He also made it a condition that they should take a man from the Muslims into the fort, and that he should remain there until al-Aḥnaf left - i.e. presumably until he left Khurāsān. The sulh was for the territory as well as for the fort.

B. 406.

45. Sulh: Tribute.

Al-Aḥnaf besieged the people of Marw al-Rūdh, and there was fierce fighting. Then the marzubān made a sulh with him for 60,000 (dirhams), or according to al-Madā'inī, 600,000. B. 406.

46. Sulh: Tribute.

Al-Aḥnaf went to Balkh, where the people made a sulh with him for 400,000 or some say 700,000 (dirhams). He left Asīd b. al-Mutashammis in charge of Balkh, and went on to

the Oxus, but failed to effect a crossing. When he returned to Balkh, he found that Asid had collected the amount agreed in the sulh. B. 408.

47. Sulh; Tribute.

'Ibn 'Amir conquered what was behind the river /i.e. west of the Oxus/, and when the people beyond the river heard of this they asked him to make a sulh with them, which he did. Some say that he crossed the river, coming to certain places; others say that the people came to him, bringing animals, slaves of both sexes, silk, and cloth.' B. 408 (U 43).

48. Sulh; Tribute.

The people of al-Tabasayn made a sulh with Ibn 'Amir for 75,000 (dirhams). Y. 192.

49. Sulh; Tribute.

The people of Herāt made a sulh with Ibn 'Amir for one million dirhams. Y. 192 f.

50. Sulh; Tribute.

The people of Jurjān made a sulh with Sa'id b. al-'As for 200,000 (dirhams). T. 2836 (Madā'inī 6).

51. Sulh; Tribute.

Without fighting, the marzubān of Sarakhs made a sulh with Ibn 'Amir for 2,200,000 (dirhams). T. 2888 (Madā'inī 10).

52. Sulh; Tribute.

After a siege the people of Balkh made a sulh with al-Aḥnaf for 400,000 (dirhams). An 'amil was left in the city. T. 2903 f (Madā'inī 12).

53. Sulh; Tribute; Hospitality.

The people of Marw al-Shāhijān made a sulh for 1,100,000 ounces (of silver ?). They had to receive the Muslims in their homes. Y. 193.

54. Sulh; Tribute (assumed).

Al-Walīd b. 'Uqba went to Adharbayjān, and al-Ash'ath b. Qays was with him. When al-Walīd departed he appointed al-Ash'ath over Adharbayjān, but they rebelled, and al-Ash'ath sent to al-Walīd asking for reinforcements. He sent him a large army from Kūfa, and he defeated them, making the same sulh as had Hudhayfa b. al-Yamān and 'Utba b. Farqad. He settled Arabs there from those who received stipends and were on the pension lists (ahl al-'atā' wa al-diwān) and instructed them to call the people to Islam.

When 'Alī became Caliph he appointed al-Ash'ath over Adharbayjān. On his arrival in the province he found that most of the people had accepted Islam and read the Qu'rān. He settled Ardabil with Arabs from ahl al-'atā' wa al-diwān, and made it a garrison town (massaraha), and built a mosque

there which, however, was afterwards enlarged.

B. 328 f (U 87).

Type B4

55. Sulḥ; Kharāj.

(This follows on from the report in 43. above, the sulḥ of Marw al-Shāhijān with Ḥātim): 'Abū 'Ubayda said that they made the sulḥ with him for slaves of both sexes, cattle, and mounts. They had no well in those days, and the kharāj was on that basis until the reign of Yazīd b. Mu'awiya, who converted it all into cash'. B. 406.

Type C3

56. Sulḥ; Amān; Tribute; Other conditions.

When al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba became 'Umar's governor over Kūfa he brought with him a letter from 'Umar to Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān appointing him to Adharbayjān. Ḥudhayfa was then at Nihāwand or near Nihāwand and he went to Ardabīl, where the marzubān had collected a fighting force from various places in the province. There was fierce fighting for some days, and then the marzubān made a sulḥ with Ḥudhayfa for all the people of Adharbayjān. The tribute was to be 800,000 dirhams, on condition that no one was killed or taken captive, and that no fire temples were destroyed. The people

would be protected against the Kurds of Shātrūdhān, al-Balāsjan, and Sabalān; the people of al-Shīz, in particular, were not to be prevented from dancing on their feast-days. B. 325 f (U 36).

57. Sulh; Amān; Tribute.

Al-Walīd b. 'Utba was appointed to Adharbayjān by 'Uthmān and he went to the province in year 25. The people of Adharbayjān asked him for sulh, which he granted on the same terms as the sulh with Hudhayfa. B. 327 (Madā'ini 1).

58. Sulh; Amān; Tribute.

When Ibn 'Amir was beseiging Nīshāpūr, one of the Persians asked him for amān on condition he let the Muslims into the city. So the Muslims entered the city, forcing the marzubān to take refuge in the citadel. Then the marzubān asked for amān on condition that he made the sulh for the whole of Nīshāpūr, and paid a tribute. So the sulh was made for one million dirhams, or some say 700,000. After its capture it was ruled by Qays b. al-Haytham. B. 404.

59. Sulh; Security; Tribute; Ahd; Written; Sharṭ.

Al-Maṣmughān, the Mardānshāh of Dunbāwand (Damāvand ?) got in touch with Nu'aym b. Muqarrin after the fall of Rayy, and proposed a treaty in order to obtain immunity from attacks by the Muslims. This was agreed, and the terms were put in

writing. The Persians were amin, i.e. safe from Muslim aggression, and for his part the Mardānshāh had to keep his people in check. The Muslims were not to raid his land or to enter it except with his permission, unless the terms were changed. Whoever changed the conditions had no 'ahd. The tribute was 200,000 dirhams annually. T. 2655 f (Sayf 23).

60. Ṣulḥ; Security; Tribute; 'Ahd; Written; Sharṭ.

This is a similar treaty to 59. above with the king of Ṭabaristan and Jīlān. The tribute was 500,000 dirhams. T. 2659 (Sayf 23).

Type C4

61. Ṣulḥ; Dhimma; Kharāj; Other conditions; Written.

This gives the text of the treaty between al-Aḥnaf b. Qays and Bādhan, marzubān of Marw al-Rūdḥ; they were to be dhimmis, and pay a kharāj of 60,000 dirhams to al-Aḥnaf and his successors, and hand over the treasure of Kisrā. They had to advise the Muslims and assist them against their enemies. The marzubān and the nobles of this family would be exempted from kharāj if they became Muslims. (They may have done so, but the text is not explicit.) T. 2897 f (Madā'inī 11).

Type C5

62. Ṣulḥ; Dhimma; Jizya; 'Ahd; Other conditions;
Written; Sharṭ.

The chief ('Azīm) of Herāt came to Ibn 'Amir and made a ṣulḥ with him, and Ibn 'Amir wrote him a treaty with the following terms: he had to advise the Muslims, and keep in good order the lands which he controlled. He had to pay the jizya, to the correct amount, and to apportion the contributions to the jizya justly among the people. Anyone who refused to pay his share had no dhimma and no 'ahd. The ṣulḥ was for Herāt, its plains and mountains, and for Būshanj and Bādghīs. B. 405.

63. Ṣulḥ; Aman; Jizya; Other conditions; Written.

This is a treaty from 'Utba b. Farqad to the people of Adharbayjān, 'its hills, plains, and frontiers, and the people of its religions (milal)'. They had aman for their lives, possessions, religions, and laws, on condition that they paid a jizya for an amount which could be tolerated - the jizya was not imposed on boys, women, the sick, or on holy men without worldly goods. The jizya was to be paid annually. The ṣulḥ applied also to strangers residing in the province. They were obliged to give hospitality to Muslims for one day and one night, and to act as guides to the Muslims. Anyone who left had aman until he reached

a place of safety. (The treaty is dated year 18, but is given in the chapter for year 22.) T. 2660 ff - treaty text on p. 2662 (Sayf 23).

64. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Dhimma; Jizya; 'Ahd; Sharṭ; Other conditions; Written.

This is a treaty from Suwayd b. Muqarrin to the people of Qūmis: They had amān for their lives, possessions, and religions, provided every adult paid a jizya for an amount which he could afford. They had to lodge and feed the Muslims for one day and one night, to give counsel to them, and to act as guides. If they altered the conditions or made light of the 'ahd, the dhimma was void. T. 2656 f (Sayf 23).

65. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Dhimma; Jizya; Other conditions; Sharṭ; Written.

Treaty between Suwayd b. Muqarrin and Ruzbān Ṣul, king of Jurjān; they were given dhimma status, and every adult had to pay an annual jizya (jizā' in text). The Muslims would protect them against their enemies, and amān was given for their lives, possessions, religions, and laws. The conditions were not to be altered. They were obliged to guide the wayfarer, advise the Muslims, and give lodging for one day and one night. The sulḥ applied to strangers living amongst

them; anyone who left had amān until he reached safety.

Cursing Muslims would be liable to punishment, and striking Muslims was punishable by death. T. 2657 f (Sayf 23).

66. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; Other conditions; Written.

This is a treaty between Surāqa b. 'Amr and Shahrbarāz, chief of al-Bāb. They made an alliance to fight against the hill people surrounding the area. Those who fought with the Muslims were exempted from taxation, but the common people had to pay jizya (jizā'), to act as guides, and to give hospitality to the Muslims for a complete day. Amān was given for their lives, possessions, and religions.

T. 2663 ff (Sayf 23).

67. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; Sharṭ; Other conditions; Written.

Treaty from Bukayr b. 'Abd Allah to the people of Muqān: they had amān for their lives, possessions, religions, and laws, provided every adult paid one dinar or its equivalent, jizya (jizā'). They had to guide and advise the Muslims, and provide lodging for one day and one night - whoever did this had amān, but if they departed from the conditions and acted deceitfully then there was no amān.

(Treaty is dated year 21, but is in the chapter for year 22.)

T. 2666 f (Sayf 23).

COMMENTARY

(a) Brief historical survey of the conquests.

The region dealt with in this section covers Adharbayjān, and the two small Caspian provinces to the east of Adharbayjān - Īlūqān and Jīlān; the province of Ṭabaristān or Mazandarān lying between the Caspian and the Elburz mountains, and its eastward extension, Jurjān; and finally the great north-eastern region of Khurāsān.

The first expedition to Adharbayjān was undertaken by Kufan troops under the command of Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān in 643/22, in the aftermath of the battle of Nihāwand, and may have been followed by a similar raid led by 'Utba b. Farqad. A more determined attempt at conquest was made by al-Walīd b. 'Uqba in 647/26 when he was governor of Kūfa. When he departed he left al-Ash'ath b. Qays over the province, and he began the policy of settling Arab veterans in the region. Even so, Adharbayjān was still not fully pacified, since Sa'īd b. al-'Āṣ went there in 651/30 with Jarīr b. 'Abd Allah, who had to fight an engagement against a combined force of Armenians and Adharbayjanians. It was probably not until al-Ash'ath b. Qays went there for the second time in the Caliphate of 'Alī that the province began to settle down under Muslim rule.¹

¹B. 325-329.

The only mention of the lands to the south and south-east of the Caspian in the time of the early conquests was the raid of Sa'īd b. al-ʿĀṣ in 651/30,¹ although some Muslim raiding parties may have approached the region shortly after Nihāwand.² Sa'īd seems to have achieved little, since the northern route to Khurāsān remained dangerous for many years because of the opposition of the people of Jurjān.³

ʿAbd Allah. b ʿĀmir invaded Khurāsān in 651/30, with al-Aḥnaf b. Qays as his lieutenant. They took the desert route from Yazd to Ṭabas Gilāk and thence via Qayin to Herāt.⁴ Herāt, Bādghīs, and Marw al-Rūdh submitted without serious opposition and the first serious check to the advance came in the Murghāb valley, where al-Aḥnaf with five thousand men was opposed by the organised forces of lower Ṭukhāristān and had to retire on Marw al-Rūdh.⁵ A second expedition was more successful and defeated a weaker force in Juzjān before advancing to the east, temporarily occupying several towns, including Balkh. Small parties made plundering raids in the neighbouring territories, not always successfully. A general uprising in 654/655- 33/34 caused the

¹B. 334 f.

²Report No. 4.

³T. 2839.

⁴B. 403 ff; T. 2682 ff, 2884 ff.

⁵B. 407.

Muslims to relinquish their hold on Khurāsān for a time although several raids by 'Alī's governors are recorded.¹

(b) The Termination of Hostilities.

The reports which are concerned with Adharbayjān are Nos. 1, 5, 21, 22, 23, 25, 33, 35, 54, 56, 57, 63, 66, 67. Five of these, Nos. 1, 25, 33, 56 and 67, deal with the early raid under Hudhayfa b. al-Yamān, and No. 1, although not mentioning the name of the leader, gives the date as A.H.22. No. 25 probably does not mean that al-Mughīra led the raid himself, but only that it was undertaken by Kūfan troops while he was governor of Kūfa, as reported in No. 56 from a local source. In all the accounts of the expeditions that followed Nihāwand the statements that such-and-such a leader was appointed by 'Umar to a given province, or even that the governor of Kūfa made the appointment, should not be taken too seriously. When one considers the distances involved, and the headstrong and impetuous nature of the tribal leaders, it becomes highly improbable that these actions in the field could have been closely controlled from Medina or from 'Irāq. Governors were appointed by the Caliph, and leaders were nominated sometimes by the Caliph and sometimes by the governor.

¹T. 2831 ff, 2905 ff; see Gibb 15-16.

But the conduct of warfare in the field of operations and the selection of objectives must have been left to the commanders in the theatre of the campaign.¹ The mention in Report No. 67 of Bukayr b. 'Abd Allah having led a force into Mūqan at the same time as Ḥudhayfa was in Adharbayjān does not necessarily make this report suspect. He may have been detached from the main force by Ḥudhayfa, or he may have made the raid on his own initiative. Individual leaders enjoyed a large measure of independence in the early years of the conquests, especially in regions which were remote from the centres of Muslim power. Report No. 56 gives the essential details of Ḥudhayfa's raid and the ensuing surrender terms, made with the marzubān. These are typical of many of the terminations of hostilities in northern and eastern Persia - sulh with the guarantee of safety in return for the payment of a tribute.

The expedition of 'Utba b. Farqad is dealt with in Reports Nos. 5 and 63. This was doubtless a predatory raid of the same type as Ḥudhayfa's, and the statement that poll-tax was imposed is therefore suspect. Report No. 35 says that al-Walīd collected the tribute which had been agreed with Ḥudhayfa as a single payment so there seems to be no question of poll-tax in the sense used

¹ Beckmann, 105 ff; Hill, 150-157.

elsewhere, although the tribute may have been collected by assessing a certain amount on every adult.

The expedition of al-Walīd b. 'Uqba is covered by Reports Nos. 21, 22, 35, 54 and 57. In addition to No. 35, No. 57 also says that the sulh of Ḥudhayfa was renewed, so it is probable that the payment of tribute was stipulated, but that it was withheld unless there was a Muslim army in the region to enforce payment. Report No. 54 is significant in that it mentions the beginning of Arab settlement in Adharbayjān, but there is some indication that it did not begin in A.H. 25 but in the time of 'Alī, as stated in the second part of the report. When Sa'īd b. al-'Ās went there later in the Caliphate of 'Uthmān (No. 23), there is no mention of his having found any Arabs living there.

Of Report No. 66, which Ṭabarī places in A.H. 22, all that need be said is that it is extremely unlikely that any Muslim forces penetrated into the country of the Khazars at such an early date.

The reports which deal with Ṭabaristān, Jurjān, and Qūmis are Nos. 4, 24, 31, 32, 36, 50, 59, 60, 64, 65. The first four of these give the essence of the story. No. 4 is from Ibn Isfandiyyār and indicates that there was an early raid by Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān, or perhaps by one of his lieutenants, and this is supported by al-Madā'inī in Report No. 31. As Ibn Isfandiyyār describes this

period the Muslim raid was only one danger among others - the rulers of the province had as much to fear from disaffected elements in their own population as from the Muslims. Report No. 24 indicates the main purpose of the expedition of Sa'id b. al-'Āṣ - to exact tribute from the rulers of these provinces as the price of leaving them unmolested. Report No. 32 lends weight to this supposition; probably the local rulers were only prepared to pay tribute when they were at a numerical disadvantage, or when their armies were needed to quell internal disturbances. At other times they were fully capable of defending themselves and of denying entry and transit rights to the Muslims. The longer reports, Nos. 59, 60, 64 and 65, are all from Sayf b. 'Umar with the same isnād, but are curiously at variance. Nos. 59 and 60, although fuller than the versions of Balādhurī and al-Mada'inī, give essentially the same details. In fact they describe a simple non-aggression pact which would cease to be valid if it were violated by either side, coupled with the payment of tribute to the Muslims. Nos. 64 and 65, however, list the kind of treaty terms that could only have been enforced when a region had been thoroughly subjugated, the type of treaty, for instance, that was imposed on Isfahān. It is quite absurd to suppose that the poll-tax could have been collected at this stage in the conquest, or that the unconquered people of Qūmis and Jurjān would have submitted

to dhimma status.

The remaining reports deal with Khurāsān, and all but two of these, Nos. 6 and 34, are concerned with the expeditions of Ibn 'Amir in 651/30 and 654/33 - 655/34. Report No. 6 mentions a raid by 'Abd Allah b. Budayl from the direction of Fārs in the time of 'Umar to al-Ṭabasayn, the fortresses which were the gateway to Khurāsān. This was doubtless no more than a foray - the continuation of this tradition in Report No. 34, which says that the people of al-Ṭabasayn came to 'Umar and made a sulh with him, can be discounted. There must be some confusion with an episode which occurred at a later period.

The campaigns of Ibn 'Amir can best be examined by considering the various phases of the expeditions, insofar as they can be identified. The advance took the Muslim armies through Qūhistan, and this stage of the conquest is dealt with in Reports Nos. 7, 37, 39 and 48. Al-Aḥnaf seems to have led the advance-guard into some opposition, including a force of Ephthalites from Herāt,¹ and to have fought a holding action until the main body of the army under Ibn 'Amir arrived. This is the tenor of the tradition contained in Reports Nos. 7 and 39. All these traditions indicate that some sort of settlement was reached with the towns in this region.

¹E.I., 'Hayāṭila' 303 f.

The key report for an understanding of events at Herāt and its territory is No. 62. In the preamble to this treaty Balādhurī says that Ibn 'Amir had dispatched an army to the region and that when the chief of the city heard of this he came to Ibn 'Amir and arranged the sulh. The treaty itself is typical of those made in this area, being negotiated directly with the ruler, who is left in control of his domains, and made responsible for assembling and delivering the tribute. The army already sent to Herāt may have continued its advance and stayed in the region until the tribute was handed over, which would account for Reports Nos. 15 and 18 stating that Herāt was conquered by a lieutenant of Ibn 'Amir. In a second report, No. 42, Balādhurī says that Ibn 'Amir went to Herāt himself and fought with the people before the sulh was made and a tribute of one million dirhams was levied. It seems more likely that he remained in the area of Nīshāpūr and controlled operations from there, sending out expeditions from this strategic centre of Khurāsān. Ya'qūbī, in Report No. 49, also gives the amount of the tribute as one million dirhams. Report No. 18 mentions the rebellion of Herāt and it may have been after this that al-Aḥnaf conquered the city by force, as stated in Report No. 2.

The main objective of Ibn 'Amir seems to have been Nīshāpūr and the region surrounding it. Operations in this area are covered

by Reports Nos. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 29, 30, 38, 58.

Report No. 58 can in fact be taken as embracing most of the information in the remaining reports. The Muslims were let into the city by a traitor and the marzubān, having first taken refuge in the citadel, was obliged to make a sulh for Nīshāpūr and its dependencies, on payment of a tribute of 700,000 or 1,000,000 dirhams. This account contradicts neither the 'sulhan' nor the 'anwatan' versions of the conquest; the artificiality of this antithesis is emphasised by the equivocations in the report from al-Nīshābūrī, who attempts to settle the question on a technicality about the illegality of taking kharāj from places conquered by sulh. This report, No. 38, confirms that the method of payment was by a fixed tribute, and that the surrender was arranged with the marzubān. Reports such as Nos. 8, 9, 10 and 11 doubtless describe the reduction of towns and villages in the region of Nīshāpūr, which must have fallen without difficulty into the hands of the Muslims. Report No. 30 records the reconquest of Nīshāpūr in A.H. 33 after they had rebelled, without further details. Probably the terms of surrender on this occasion were similar to those imposed the first time. It is interesting to read, in Report No. 13, that there was an Arab colony left by Ibn 'Āmir which survived in Nīshāpūr until the governorship of Ziyād, but it is likely that this settlement was made somewhat later, perhaps when Ibn 'Āmir's

lieutenants reconquered Khurāsān in 662-4/42-43.¹

The leaders of other important cities in central Khurāsān appear to have made terms with Ibn 'Amir without fighting; it probably seemed prudent to do this after the fall of Nishāpūr. The relevant reports are: Nos. 3, 30, 43, 53, 55 - Marw al-Shāhijān; No. 40 - Nasā and Abiward; No. 41 - Tūs; No. 51 - Sarakhs. The first two reports for Marw al-Shāhijān mention al-Aḥnaf b. Qays, but No. 30 makes it clear that this was after they had rebelled, and that this was the reconquest, during Ibn 'Amir's second expedition to Khurāsān in A.H. 33. Otherwise all these reports indicate that these settlements were made for reasons of expediency by the rulers during the first expedition in A.H. 30-31. All the treaties are similar and stipulate the payment of a fixed tribute which had to be collected and handed over by the local authorities, as described in Report No. 43.

The principal source for the early campaigns in Tukhāristān is the account in Balādhuri's Futūḥ, pp. 406-408. This describes the capture of Marw al-Rūdḥ by al-Aḥnaf b. Qays and his advance to the east with a force of 5,000 men - 4,000 Arabs and 1,000 Persians. He was opposed in the Murghāb valley by a force of

¹E.I., 'Abd Allah b. Amir' 43.

30,000 men composed of warriors assembled from lower Tukhāristān, with a contingent from Soghdiāna. The text does not actually say that the Muslims were defeated, but this is implied by the statement that al-Aḥnaf returned to Marw al-Rūdh. Al-Aḥnaf later sent out a second expedition under al-Aqra' b. Ḥābis, and this was more successful, defeating an enemy force in Juzjān before advancing eastwards. Several towns were occupied temporarily, including Balkh. Al-Aḥnaf himself seems to have taken part in the later stages of this campaign.

The reports which deal with the conquest of Marw al-Rūdh are Nos. 3, 14, 19, 44, 45, 61. Nos. 3 and 14 are from Ya'qūbī, and confirm that the Muslim leader was al-Aḥnaf. No. 19, from Tabarī quoting Wāqidī, refers to the second conquest of the city after they had rebelled, i.e. in A.H. 33-34. Report No. 44 concerns the capture of the fortress which came to be known as 'Qasr al-Aḥnaf', which Balādhurī says was in the district of Marw al-Rūdh. The other two reports, Nos. 45 and 61, record the ṣulḥ with the marzubān of the city, with terms that are typical for the treaties in Khurāsān. In Report No. 61 the expression 'kharāj' does not mean land-tax, but tribute. The comment about the marzubān and other nobles being exempt from kharāj if they accepted Islam is probably an anachronism when applied to this very early stage in the conquest of the province.

The operations to the east are covered by Reports Nos. 26, 27, 28, 46, 47, 52. The first three of these do little more than record the progress of the Muslim forces towards Balkh, and the fact that temporary pacts were arranged with places on their route. No. 46, from Balādhurī, and No. 52, from Ṭabarī quoting al-Madā'inī, give basically the same details. Both mention that an 'amil was left in the city, but the report from Balādhurī makes it clear that this was not an attempt to garrison the city permanently. He was left there to ensure that the tribute was collected while al-Aḥnaf went raiding on the vicinity. When the tribute had been handed over, it can be assumed that the entire Muslim force, including the 'amil, left Balkh.

It is improbable that Ibn 'Amir himself ever got as far as the Oxus, or had dealings with the people on the east bank of the river, as is stated in Report No. 47. After recording this tradition from Abū 'Ubayda, Balādhurī adds: 'No-one except him [Abū 'Ubayda] mentions Ibn 'Amir having crossed the river or having made a ḡulh with the people of the east bank'.

The early campaigns in these northern and eastern regions - Adharbayjān, Ṭabaristan, and Khurāsān - followed a similar pattern. They were large-scale raids rather than conquests and they all met with determined opposition. Movable booty was amassed and the rulers of cities and even provinces were put under tribute, but as soon as the Muslim army had departed the local rulers

re-asserted their authority and the position of affairs remained largely unaltered. Every new Muslim expedition, therefore, had almost to start from the beginning. The start of the true conquests can be detected in the reports which mention the early attempts at Arab colonisation, but the murder of 'Uthmān and the ensuing discord in Islam caused the Muslim advance to lose most of its momentum. Only after Mu'āwīya was firmly established in power did the conquests begin again in earnest.

In all these regions the prevailing system of taxation was by fixed tribute, the amount of which was agreed with the local chief, whose only responsibility to the Muslims was to hand over the required amount. He made the assessments on individuals and collected the tax, presumably ensuring that there was an excess over the sum demanded by the Muslims for diverting to his own treasury. Thus although the individual might pay a land-tax and a poll-tax as he did in Syria, 'Irāq and Egypt, he did not pay it direct to the Muslim tax collection, but to the agents of his own ruler.¹

¹See Dennett, 116-118.

H. Armenia

LIST OF REPORTS

Type A1

1. Ḥabīb b. Maslama went to Armenia in year 23. Y. 180.
2. Forces from Syria under Ḥabīb b. Maslama, and forces from Kūfa under Ṣalmān b. Rabī'a operated together in Armenia in year 25, reducing fortresses and taking booty and prisoners. A dispute arose between Ḥabīb and Ṣalmān over the distribution of the spoils. B. 198.
3. Ṣalmān b. Rabī'a raided Armenia, killing and taking booty and prisoners. (Given in chapter for year 24.) T. 2806 (Abū Hikhnaḥ 6).
4. 'Mu'awiya sent Ḥabīb to Armenia in October (year 25 ?), and the Arabs began to loot and pillage. They made the people captive, burnt villages, and then returned to their country rejoicing.' MS 441.

Type A5

5. Jizya.
Ṣalmān b. Rabī'a summoned the Kurds of Balāsajān, in Arrān, to Islam but they fought against him and were defeated. Some were made to pay jizya, and some sadaga, but the latter were few. B. 203.

Type B1.6. Sulh.

Ṣalman made a sulh with the king of Sharwān, with the king of al-Lakz, and with the people of Masqaṭ and the people of Baylaqān. Y. 194.

Type B2.7. Sulh; Billeting.

'Ḥabīb b. Maslama made a sulh with the people of Jurzān and the land of Armenia, on condition that they billeted the troops, providing food that was lawful for People of the Book.' AU 147 (U 77).

Type B3.8. Sulh; Tribute; Other conditions.

The patriarch of Baghrawand came to Ḥabīb b. Maslama, and made a sulh with him for the town, agreeing to pay tribute (itāwa), advise them, give them hospitality, and help them against their enemies. B. 200.

9. Sulh; Tribute.

The people of Bardh'a made a sulh with Salmān, agreeing to pay a certain sum. Y. 194.

10. Sulh; Tribute.

Crossing al-Kurr, Salmān b. Rabi' reduced Qabala, and the

chief of Shakkan and al-Qamībarān made a sulh with him, agreeing to pay a tribute (itāwa). Others to make a sulh with him included the people of Khayzān, the king of Sharwān and other kings of the mountains, and the people of Masqaṭ, al-Shābirān, and al-Bāb.

Then the city of al-Bāb was closed to him, and Khaqān with his cavalry met Salman beyond the Balanjar river. Salman was killed together with four thousand Muslims. B. 203 f.

Type B4.

11. Sulh; Kharāj.

The patriarch of Busfurrajan came to Ḥabīb and made a sulh with him for all his lands, on payment of an annual kharj (sic). B. 200.

12. Sulh; Kharāj.

Al-Sīsajan resisted but Ḥabīb conquered them and made a sulh with the holders of the forts for the payment of a kharj (sic). B. 200 f.

Type B5.

13. After fighting, the people of Armenia IV made a sulh with 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣ, for a jizya of one dinar on every man. T. 2506 (I.I. 5).

Type B6

14. Ṣulḥ; Jizya; Kharāj.

Ḥabīb sent men to the towns of Arjīsh and Bājunays, who conquered them and imposed the jizya on the heads of the people. The leading men came to Ḥabīb and he made them responsible for the kharāj of these towns. B.200.

Type C3

15. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Tribute; Written.

After taking Qālīqalā Ḥabīb went to Mirbālā, where the patrician of Khilāṭ came to him, bringing a statement from 'Iyād b. Ghanm, in which 'Iyad had stated that he gave him aman for his life, possessions, and his country, and that he was responsible for the tribute (itāwa). (See B. 176.) Ḥabīb confirmed this. He then brought Ḥabīb the money which he owed and a present - Ḥabīb refused the latter. Ḥabīb then visited Khilāṭ, and passed on to Ṣababa (?), where he was met by the chief of Muks, one of the districts of Busfurrajān. Ḥabīb made him responsible for his country (or made him the fief-holder), and sent a man with him who wrote him a treaty of sulḥ and aman. B. 199 f.

16. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Tribute.

Ḥabīb conquered Ḥawārīḥ, Kasfaryabs, Kisāl, Khunān,

Samsakhī, al-Jardamān, Kastasjī, Shawshit, and Bāzalīt. The terms of the sulh were that the lives of the people be spared, that their places of worship and city walls were not interfered with, and that they paid tribute (itāwa) for their lands and persons. The people of the following places also made a sulh with Ḥabīb: Qalarjīt, Tharyālīt, Khākhīt, Khūkhīt, Arṭahāl, and Bab al-Lāl. Ṣanāriyya and Dūdāniyya made a sulh with him on payment of a tribute (itāwa). B. 202 f.

Type C5.

17. Sulh; Amān; Jizya; 'Ahd; Other conditions; Written.

Ḥabīb came to Taflīs and wrote to its people a sulh:

'... Ḥabīb b. Maslama gives amān to the people of Taflīs for their lives, churches, convents, religious services and faith, provided they acknowledge their humiliation and pay a jizya of one dinar for every household. You are not to combine households to decrease tax, and we are not to divide them to increase it. You owe us advice and support against our enemies to the utmost of your ability, and you must entertain the needy Muslim for one night, and provide him with food of the 'people of the Book' which is lawful for us. If a Muslim is cut off from his companions

and falls into your hands, you are to deliver him to the nearest body of believers, unless something stands in your way. If you become Muslims you are our brothers, if not you must pay the jizya. If you are attacked by an enemy of yours, and subjugated while the Muslims are too busy to come to your aid, the Muslims are not responsible, nor have you violated your 'ahd.'

At a later time this treaty was seen by al-Jarrāḥ b. 'Abd Allah and endorsed by him with a second statement. B. 201 f.

The text of Ḥabīb's treaty is also to be found, with almost identical wording, in Abū 'Ubayd 208 f (U 82).

18. Sulh; Aman; Jizya; Written.

As Ḥabīb was advancing to Jurzān he was met by a messenger from the patrician and the people, bringing a gift, and asking for sulh and aman. He wrote them a treaty: '... I have estimated the value of your gift and have considered it as part of your jizya. I have written an aman and have made one condition; if you keep it, well and good; if not - war.' B. 201 (U 24).

19. Sulh; Aman; Jizya; Other conditions.

Ḥabīb camped around Qālīqalā, with 6,000 or 8,000 of the people of Syria and al-Jazīra. A sortie was defeated and

then they asked for sulḥ and amān, agreeing to leave the city, or to pay the jizya. Many left and went as far as Byzantium. Mu'āwīya sent 2,000 men to Ḥabīb as reinforcements, who were settled in Qālīqalā, given fiefs, and stationed there as a garrison (murābiṭa). B. 197 f.

Type C6

20. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj; Sharṭ.

Salṃān b. Rabi'a conquered al-Baylaqān, in Arrān, whose people made a sulḥ with him, receiving amān for their lives, possessions, and city wall. He made it a condition (sharṭ) that they paid jizya and kharāj. B. 203.

21. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj; Sharṭ.

Salṃān b. Rabi'a camped around the city of Bardha'a at harvest time and raided the surrounding villages, until the people asked for sulḥ. The sulḥ was on the same terms as that of al-Baylaqān. He then sent his cavalry which conquered Shifshīn, al-Misfawān, Ūdh, al-Misryān, al-Hurḥilyān, and Tabār, all of which are districts. Other places in Arrān were also reduced. B. 203.

22. Ṣulḥ; Amān; Jizya; Kharāj; Sharṭ, 'Ahd; Written.

After a siege with fighting, the inhabitants of Dabīl asked Ḥabīb b. Maslama for sulḥ and amān. The treaty from Ḥabīb

read: '... To the Jews, Magians, and Christians of Dabīl, present and absent; I have granted you amān for your lives, possessions, churches and places of worship, and city wall. You have amān, and we are bound to fulfil the 'ahd as long as you fulfil yours and pay jizya and kharāj.'

Ḥabīb conquered al-Nashawā on the same ḡulḥ as Dabīl.

B. 200.

COMMENTARY

(a) Note on the history of the conquests.

This note is based upon the article 'Arminiya' in the Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd Edition; in particular the section 'Armenia under Arab domination' by M. Canard, pages 635-637. It is beyond the scope of this work to attempt to construct the history of this conquest. As Canard says: 'The history of the conquest of Armenia by the Arabs still presents in its details many uncertainties and obscurities, for the information found in the Arab, Armenian and Greek sources is often contradictory'.

The early incursion by 'Iyād b. Ḡhanm may have some historical foundation.¹ Other invasions, both from Syria and from Adharbayjān, may have occurred before the death of 'Umar, but in 643/22 a sharp defeat was inflicted on them by Theodorus Ṛshtuni, compelling them to retreat from Armenia. For some years there were no further incursions, and Armenia once again recognised the suzerainty of the Byzantine Emperor. In 653/32, a three year truce between the Arabs and the Emperor having expired, Theodorus made a voluntary submission to Mu'ā'iyā, in order to prevent a threatened invasion by the Arabs. He obtained very favourable

¹B. 176; see al-Jazīra Report No. 9.

terms for Armenia, the only stipulation being that they recognised Muslim suzerainty. In the same year, however, the Emperor entered the country with an army of 100,000 men and brought all Armenia and Georgia once again under his control. In the following year the Emperor departed and an Arab army at once entered the country. With the aid of these forces Theodorus drove the Greeks from the country and was recognised by Mu'āwīya as prince of Armenia, Georgia, and Albania (Arabic: Arrān). The Greek attempts at reconquest failed completely and in 655/34 the Arabs extended their domination over the whole of Armenia. In 657/36 however, when the first civil war between Mu'āwīya and 'Alī broke out, the former had need of his army of occupation in Armenia and the country, denuded of troops, fell once again into Byzantine hands. Arab sovereignty was restored when Mu'āwīya assumed the Caliphate in 661/41.

As will be seen in the reports, the Muslim historians have merged all these events in the great campaign of Ḥabīb b. Maslama in 644-646/24-25, whereas the first real conquest of Armenia was probably carried out in the years 654/33 to 655/34. Moreover, there is no mention in the Arab sources of the re-establishment of Byzantine sovereignty after the first Arab invasions in the time of 'Umar, nor of the voluntary submission of Theodorus to Mu'āwīya.

In view of the foregoing, it will not be possible to assign events to distinct phases of the conquest, as has been done with some degree of confidence for the other regions. All that can be said is that the more detailed treaties must be placed in the final period of the early conquest, i.e. from 654/33 to 655/34.

(b) The Termination of Hostilities.

The route taken by Ḥabīb b. Maslama is fairly clear from the account of Balādhurī even if the year is in doubt, and the direction of his advance is in agreement with that given by the Armenian historian Sebeos.¹ He went first to Qālīqalā (modern Erzerum) as stated in Report No. 19, and then turned south-east for Khilāṭ (modern Ahlat) which lies on the shores of Lake Van. This stage is recorded in Report No. 15, but before arriving at Khilāṭ Ḥabīb had to defeat a large Byzantine army, reinforced by contingents of Khazars and Alans.² Report No. 22 deals with the third main event in Ḥabīb's march, the capture of Dabīl or Dwin, and the final episode, the reduction of Taflīs, is recorded in Report No. 17. The narrative is interrupted (pp. 197-198) with the story of the arrival of Salmān b. Rabi',

¹ E.I., 'Armīniya' 636.

² B. 197-198.

with a force from Kūfa, and his dispute with Ḥabīb over the distribution of booty. Other reports on the campaign of Salīmān, however, locate his theatre of operations further to the east, in Arrān and as far north as al-Bāb. Since he was based on Kūfa it would have been natural for his line of advance to take him into this area since it would lead through territory which had already been conquered by Kūfan forces. It was also sound strategy for Salīmān to keep the potentially hostile peoples of Arrān and Georgia in check while Ḥabīb was subjugating the heartland of Armenia. It is possible however, that he assisted Ḥabīb to defeat the Greeks on the Euphrates, and then turned his attention to the north-east.

The key reports for Ḥabīb's conquest are those mentioned above - in chronological order Nos. 19, 15, 22 and 17. Report No. 19 refers to the stationing of a sizeable garrison in Qālīqalā, which would have been an essential measure in a country of doubtful allegiance which was still liable to invasion from Byzantium. It is probable, therefore, that this was a deliberate act of policy. The jizya which is said to have been imposed upon the people of Qālīqalā may have been a poll-tax, since it certainly had this connotation for the city of Taflīs, according to Report No. 17, and elsewhere.

Whereas the terms for Qālīqalā, Taflīs and Dabīl seem to

have been agreed with the inhabitants of those cities directly, and the tax imposed on individuals, the treaty with Khilāṭ is similar to those made in Khurāsān. It was negotiated with the patrician who was made responsible for the tribute, and the same type of sulḥ was made with the ruler of Muks. It is unlikely that the fact that the patrician of Khilāṭ had retained the statement of 'Iyād had anything to do with the terms which he obtained, since the same kind of agreement is referred to in Reports Nos. 8-12, where no such earlier treaty existed. It may be that Report No. 14 provides the explanation, in that the tax was assessed on the individual, but it was the responsibility of the chiefs to collect it and deliver it to the Muslims. It is by no means improbable, incidentally, that the chief of Khilāṭ had kept 'Iyād's statement. The people of Armenia were so accustomed to changes of masters that the possession of such documents was no doubt regarded as a valuable insurance.

Reports Nos. 17 and 22 have preserved the texts of the treaties with Taflīs and Dabīl respectively, and these are basically similar, although the former is considerably longer. There seems no reason to doubt the authenticity of these documents, which are quite different from the 'fiqh' type of treaties which appear in reports elsewhere. Report No. 17, for instance, having listed the items covered by the amān, requires the people to acknowledge

the humiliation and pay the jizya, but this is a ritual phrase with almost the same wording as Qu'rān IX, 29. Thereafter the conditions for aid and assistance to the Muslims are merely the basic requirements for an army operating in a country where their tenure was insecure. The final provision, that if the inhabitants were attacked at a time when the Muslims were unable to come to their aid then this was not a violation of the treaty from either side, shows that Ḥabīb had a practical grasp of the realities of the situation. He must have realised that Muslim rule was not yet firmly established in the country and that a Byzantine counter-attack was a distinct possibility. Presumably he wished to ensure that, in the event of a temporary Muslim withdrawal, the treaty could come back into force without recriminations from either side. It seems that this is precisely what happened when the Muslims returned to the city under al-Jarrāḥ b. 'Abd Allah.

The remainder of Ḥabīb's itinerary was as follows: as stated in Report No. 15, he moved from Khilāṭ to the area of Muks, where he arranged the surrender of that town and its territory with its chief; while in this area he sent out commanders to subdue Arjīsh and Bājunays, and the rulers of these towns came to Ḥabīb and negotiated the surrender terms (No. 14). He then advanced to the vicinity of Dabīl and laid siege to the city, compelling them after a short time to surrender (No. 22).

While he was besieging the city his cavalry roamed about, reducing towns and villages in the area.¹ Ḥabīb then moved on, accepted the submission of the patrician of the region of Busfurrajān (No. 11), reduced al-Sīsajān and made a sulh with its fort-holders (No. 12), and then entered Jurzān. The patrician of Jurzān sent an embassy to Ḥabīb, offering his submission, which he accepted, and wrote him a statement (Nos. 7 and 18). As noted above his next conquest was the city of Taflīs (Tiflis), and he also reduced a number of towns in the region of Taflīs (No. 16).

Balādhurī places the campaign of Salmān b. Rabi'a in Arrān in the same period as the operation of Ḥabīb in Armenia proper. The relevant reports are Nos. 5, 6, 9, 10, 20, 21. These reports indicate that the terminations of hostilities were little different from those obtained in Ḥabīb's campaign. Report No. 6, from Ya'qūbī, shows once again that treaties were sometimes negotiated with the rulers and sometimes with the people. The people are mentioned as having been the contracting party in important centres such as Baylaqān (No. 20), and Bardha'a (No. 21), so it may be that the burghers were strong enough to act independently, without reference to the landowning nobility.

It appears that the system of taxation in Armenia, at least in this early period, was similar to that in Khurāsān. This is made clear in three reports - Nos. 15, 16 and 17 - in which it

is stated that there was to be payment by means of a tribute for which the ruler was responsible. The amount of the tribute is not given in these reports, and it appears that it was not a fixed sum, as in Khurāsān, but could fluctuate with the number of inhabitants, as stated in Report No. 17.

Section V

ANALYSIS OF SOURCES AND CONCLUSION

ANALYSIS OF THE REPORTS

With several hundred reports from various sources it would be expected that differences would arise in two ways: first that accounts for the same event would differ among the different versions; secondly that the accounts for region X would be broadly different from the accounts for region Y. The reports have been considered, therefore, first as a single body of evidence, and then compared on a regional basis. This brief survey attempts to derive some conclusions on points of particular relevance - no claim to statistical precision is put forward.

The computer print-out does not tally exactly with the report listings given in the typescript. Some records from the former were grouped under single item numbers in the latter for convenience of presentation, and a few reports were added to the thesis after the print-out had been obtained. The print-out was used in quantifying results for this analysis because it is easier to use for such a purpose, but there is no significant difference between the two documents, and the typed reports could equally well be used for an exercise of this kind.

General Data

Number of Reports in Computer record	- 544
Number of Reports in Typescript	- 496

Reports were obtained from the following sources:

	<u>Source</u>	<u>Number of Reports</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1.	Balādhurī - <u>Futūh</u>	244	45
2.	Ṭabarī	124	23
3.	Ya'qūbī	48	9
4.	Abū Yūsuf	29	5
5.	Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam	32	6
6.	Abū 'Ubayd	29	5
7.	Dīnawarī	15	3
8.	Others	23	4

A few reports from the following works are included in the typescript but not in the print-out: Balādhurī, Ansāb al-Ashraf; Ibn A'tham, Futūh; Tārīkh Nishābur; Tārīkh-i-Sīstān.

The list of main sources gives a good indication of the relative importance of the various sources for a work of this kind, but it is only an indication. A numerical count does not tell one the value of one source compared with another, but it is hoped that this assessment was adequately performed in Section III. It is probably true to say, however, that the percentages present a fair picture of the relative value of the major works, and show how one is subject to the law of diminishing returns once the first six works on the list have been studied.

During the course of his research the author felt that there were several expressions whose incidence among the various transmitters would repay examination. It is appreciated that the selection of these expressions involves a value judgement, but it has already been stated that this is not a rigorous statistical analysis, and in any case these results would not have been presented were it not considered that they point to significant conclusions.

The expressions are: dhimma, jizya, and kharāj.

Of the 544 reports in the computer record, there were 375 which contained one or more of the conditions which were taken to be significant - the remaining 169 were simple statements recording conquests. In the 375 reports there were 182 which contained one or more of the expressions under examination, and the number of mentions for each expression was as follows:

dhimma - 48 (18.7%)

jizya - 137 (53.2%)

kharāj - 72 (28.1%)

257

Thus 'jizya' has nearly twice the frequency of 'kharāj', and nearly three times the frequency of 'dhimma'. The frequency of 'jizya'

can be explained by the fact that it occurs in the Quranic passage which gives instructions for the treatment of Scriptuaries (IX, 29), and hence would have been familiar to all Muslims from the outset. The count does not seem to bear out Khadduri's thesis that 'kharāj' was the general word for 'tax',¹ since one would then have expected it to occur at least as frequently as 'jizya'.

The legal canon lays down that payment of jizya is a concomitant of dhimma status, and one might therefore have expected a much greater correlation between the two terms, especially if Caetani's assertion that the evidence was forged to accord with the principles of the jurists were correct.² In fact the transmitters seem to have followed the actual course of events more closely than is often supposed, and in this case they have given a high frequency to the expression that would have occurred most readily to the early Muslims.

If no reporter had any tendency to use one expression more or less frequently than the average, then the reports from each source would repeat the percentages shown above.

E.g. for Balādhurī: one would calculate the mean figure:
 Number of reports containing one or more of the three terms - 41.
Dhimma: $41 \times \frac{257}{182} \times 18.7 = 10.85$. Similar calculations give
jizya = 30.9, kharāj = 16.3 And so on for all the sources.

¹Khadduri, 187-190.

²Ca 23/518.

This mean predicted figure can now be compared with the actual number of mentions. In the following table, the figures for Ya'qūbī, Balādhurī and Abū Yūsuf are for reports of these authors which are without isnāds. Reports listed under other authorities may, of course, have come from the works of these authors. All reports from Balādhurī are from the Futūh.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Number of Reports</u>	<u>Dhimma Mentions</u>		<u>Jizya Mentions</u>		<u>Kharāj Mentions</u>	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Balādhurī	41	10.85	9	30.9	34	16.3	31
Ya'qūbī	7	1.84	0	5.27	2	2.77	5
Abū Yūsuf	1	0.26	1	0.75	1	0.40	0
B. Ishāq	15	3.94	5	11.3	15	5.95	1
B. Lahī'a	5	1.32	0	3.76	3	1.98	2
Mada'ini	1	0.26	1	0.75	0	0.40	1
Al-Layth	8	2.07	2	4.73	6	3.18	1
Sayf	45	11.85	20	33.8	35	17.9	8
Wāqidī	6	1.58	1	4.5	4	2.37	4
Others	53	14.0	9	39.8	37	21.0	19
	<u>182</u>		<u>48</u>		<u>137</u>		<u>72</u>

There is little to be deduced from those sources which have less than ten reports, as far as frequency of the expressions is concerned. One may notice, however, that Ya'qūbī reverses the normal

pattern, and uses 'kharāj' more frequently than 'jizya'. The appearance of only one report from Abū Yūsuf is somewhat misleading as this applies to reports without isnāds, and of course Abū Yūsuf quotes authorities who employ these expressions - several of the Ibn Ishāq reports in this list are from Abū Yūsuf's work. The case of Madā'inī is rather different, since from the 16 reports in the print-out which carry his name, only one mentions 'dhimma' or the fiscal terms. It may be inferred from this that his interests lay in other fields.

Three of the authorities listed appear to give significant results. Balādhurī is near the norm for 'dhimma' and 'jizya' but has a frequency for 'kharāj' which is much higher than the average. It appears from this that he was particularly interested in questions of land occupancy, a view which is strengthened by the fact that he devoted chapters in the Futūh to the founding and laying out of Kūfa (275-289) and Baṣra (346-372), and to the administration of the kharāj lands (447-448).

Ibn Ishāq, on the other hand, with his preference for the expression 'jizya', and only one reference to 'kharāj', seems to be keeping closely to Quranic terminology, as could perhaps have been expected.

The vocabulary of Sayf b. 'Umar gives the closest correlation of any of the sources between 'dhimma' and 'jizya' with relatively few mentions of 'kharāj'. Particularly noticeable is the prevalence

of the word 'dhimma', Sayf having 20 mentions out of 45 reports, as opposed to 48 out of the total of 182 reports. This frequency is about 70⁰/o above the average, and Sayf's use of 'dhimma' represents 42⁰/o of all the occurrences of this term in the reports. It can be inferred, therefore, that Sayf, alone among the major authorities, was indeed attempting to construct his version to suit the theories and practices of his own time, at least as far as his use of the term 'dhimma' is concerned. The evidence points strongly towards the conclusion that this expression, with its connotation of second-class status for non-Muslims, was not in general use at the time of the early conquests. The same comment does not apply to the term 'amān', which occurs in the reports 110 times, in the sense of 'the promise of security for lives and property', usually in return for the payment of tax or tribute. The word does not have the same implication of inferiority and humiliation that 'dhimma' bears, and the granting of amān simply continued the ancient Arab obligation of giving protection or jiwār.¹ (The term man'a, or 'protection against external enemies', is found almost exclusively in Tabari.)

Before concluding this brief analysis of the reports, taken as a whole, it is necessary to mention one kind of treaty, which has been designated 'fiḡh-type' in the commentaries. This is the

¹E.I., 'Amān' 429.

type which includes clauses placing restrictions and prohibitions on the practice of the Christian religion. These include the banning of the public exhibition of crosses or the sounding of clappers, edicts regulating the dress of non-Muslims, the prohibition on the building of new churches, etc. Doubt has been cast on the authenticity of these treaties during the course of this work, as embodying the principles and practices of a later, less tolerant age. It is significant that they occur only in Christian countries, where the members of that faith still co-existed with the Muslims in later centuries, providing a target for the sporadic outbreaks of fanaticism. No treaties of this nature are found in Persia, where the Magian faith had ceased to be a living force by the time the historians and jurists compiled their works.

There are very few of these treaties in the sources - only six have been identified in the report assembled in this work.

These are:

1. Syria No. 9. For Syria and 'part of al-Ḥīra'.
(Abū Yūsuf 80 (No Isnād)
2. Syria No. 91. For Syria.
(Abū Yūsuf 80-82 (Makḥūl al-Shāmī)
3. Al-Jazira No. 13. For 'Anat.
Abū Yūsuf 86 f (Ibn Ishāq 4)

4. Al-Jazīra No. 21. For Ruḥā.
B. 172 (Bakr b. al-Haytham 3)
5. Al-Jazīra No. 30. For Raqqā.
B. 172 f (Wāqidī 1).
6. 'Irāq No. 71. For Ḥīra.
Abū Yūsuf 83-85 (Ibn Ishāq 4)

There could be no clearer indication than this of Abū Yūsuf's tendency to select his evidence to suit his theories, when four such treaties are found in his work, against two from Balādhurī's Futūḥ, while the total number of reports from these two authors is 29 and 244 respectively. Even so, it was selection rather than distortion that Abū Yūsuf used to present evidence that accorded with his principles. For instance, he transmits a long, and quite convincing report from an anonymous shaykh of Ḥīra, giving details of the conquest of al-Jazīra (No. 14) which does not include any of the 'fiqh' terms.

When the reports are compared on a regional basis several important differences come to light, reflecting the varied conditions encountered by the Muslims in the different regions. A simple count of 'sulh' and 'no-sulh' terminations does not yield very significant results, since the pattern is obscured by the fact that there are often two or more reports for the same

place , and by the intrusion of 'sulh' versus 'anwatan' arguments. It is preferable to study the texts of the reports and the commentaries for an appreciation of the way in which the conquests were achieved.

The table below gives a count of the number of times the expression 'amān' occurs in each region, expressed as a percentage of the total number of reports in each region.

<u>Region</u>	<u>'Amān' in Treaties</u>
	<u>%</u>
Armenia	33
Egypt	8
South and Central Persia	22
'Irāq	10
Al-Jazīra	19
North Persia	16
Syria	36
North Africa	0

The low figures for Egypt and 'Irāq are due to the fact that many of the reports are concerned with the occupation of land without formal surrender. In North Africa there was only one sulh termination, that of the Pentapolis, but the arrangements were probably of a rudimentary nature.

The high figure for Armenia is based on a small sample, but

it probably reflects the true situation, since if there had been a prior arrangement between Mu'āwiya and Theodorus a fairly civilised treatment of the inhabitants was to be expected.

The percentage for al-Jazīra is perhaps somewhat lower than might have been expected, in view of the fact that little opposition was encountered. There seems to be no ready explanation for this.

A significant comparison can be made between the figures for Syria and those for Persia, particularly since both are based upon a considerable number of reports. The percentages alone show a wide divergence between the two countries, which is in fact even wider than appears from first glance. This is because many of the 'amāns' given in Persia were simply promises not to kill or to take captives, while most of those in Syria gave full protection for lives, families, homes, possessions, and churches. This is doubtless partly a reflection of the relative difficulty of the two campaigns, as much fiercer resistance was met with in Persia than in Syria. Added to this, however, there was probably a greater respect in the mind of the Arabs for Christianity than for the Persian religion; despite later rationalisations the Prophet did not designate the Magians as 'People of the Book'.

There are further differences that are emphasised by the report listings. Although a numerical comparison of 'sulh' and 'non-sulh' terminations is not considered feasible, it is noticeable that the number of 'non-sulh' reports is markedly less in Syria than in the other regions. Of the urban areas only Caesarea and other coastal towns, and a few small towns on Khālid's route from 'Irāq are mentioned as having been taken by force. Greek control of the sea and the presence of Greek garrisons made necessary the forcible reduction of the coastal towns; Khālid's 'conquests' of towns in the Palmyrene were little more than raids. Other references to 'anwatan' conquests in Syria are rare, and apply to the countryside. No. 64, for instance, refers to the occupation of land in Jordan, while No. 94 says that 'the land in Syria was 'anwatan, though the cities were sulhan'. This seems to mean only that the land was occupied by the Muslims in places where there was no civil authority with whom to negotiate, which probably included former Byzantine state domains. Where the land was attached to a city it was included in the settlement terms for that city, e.g. Tiberias (No. 51), Hims (No. 52), Ḥamā (No. 58). There were no real rebellions in Syria - the 'rebellion' mentioned in Report No. 64 refers to a temporary re-occupation of Tiberias by Byzantine forces. In

general it may be said that the conquest of Syria consisted of the destruction of the Byzantine field army, followed by the surrender of the towns and cities, including municipal land, and the occupation of Domain land and waste land.

The difference between Syria and Persia lay mainly in the fierce resistance offered by individual cities in Persia, so that rebellions and conquests by force are much more frequently mentioned in Persia. It is not always possible to ascertain which of the conquests of a given city was by force and which by surrender, but it seems likely that in most cases the terms of the gulf which are given are those which came into force when the city was permanently subdued. In the frontier areas such as Tabaristān and Tukhāristān no permanent settlements were achieved during the period under review.

Once Khuzistān and the central Persian provinces had been finally pacified the situation with regard to the countryside seems to have been similar to that prevailing in Syria. The agreements often stipulate that the surrender terms for a city applied also to its lands - e.g. South and Central Persia Nos. 52, 77, 79, 103, 109 and North Persia Nos. 38, 58. The tax or tribute was then for both the city and its lands. As in Syria there are references to land having been occupied by force - e.g. South and Central Persia Nos. 32, 50, 95 - but this seems to mean only that

the Muslims entered the area. The actual surrender terms were probably then agreed separately with the city.

The situation in 'Irāq and Egypt, where agriculture was relatively more important than in the other regions, was that the terms with the major cities were made separately from the settlement of the countryside. The conditions were imposed on the peasants through the medium of the landowners. There was no surrender of the land because there had been no fighting - it was merely occupied. The arguments in the traditions as to whether Egypt and the Sawād were sulḥan or 'anwatan are therefore artificial and superfluous.

In none of the regions was there anything approaching democracy. In Egypt the settlements were concluded with Cyrus, with the landowners and the Coptic clergy, in 'Irāq and Persia with the dihqāns and the marzubāns - one might say with the gentry and the nobility. Only in Syria do the reports usually state that the terms were agreed with the people. In other words, the effective instrument in each city was the municipality, composed, one may assume, of the wealthier citizens, the senior Jacobite clergy, and perhaps the sayyids of the settled Arab tribes.

Many of the treaties include conditions of a general nature. The use of the expressions 'dhimma' and 'amān' has already

been discussed, as has the suspect nature of the anti-Christian terms, but there are a number of other stipulations that occur in the reports. These are:

1. Protection for churches, places of worship, religion.
2. Hospitality.
3. Maintenance of roads and bridges.
4. Provision of food for the Muslims.
5. Assistance and advice to the Muslims, acting as spies and guides.
6. Prohibitions against insulting or striking Muslims.
7. Provision for clothing for the Muslims.

None of these conditions appears in the reports for North Africa, where the sulh with the Pentapolis seems to have been a very simple arrangement, while the expeditions to the east were merely large-scale raids. This region is therefore ignored in the discussion which follows. Protection and tolerance for religious practice and places of worship is a condition that occurs in the reports for all regions, including Persia. From this it may be inferred that the ancient Arab custom of jiwar and Muḥammad's instructions for the treatment of the 'People of the Book' combined to influence the Muslim conquerors in the direction of tolerance.

The provision of hospitality was also laid down in some of the treaties in every region, again reflecting an old Arab usage.

For travellers to find food and shelter was an absolute necessity in foreign lands, where climatic conditions were frequently severe. The requirement for the inhabitants to supply every Muslim with a fixed quantity of rations, however, is found only in reports on Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia. It is not easy to deduce a reason for this, unless the Byzantine tax laws, which were adopted by the Muslims,¹ allowed for a similar levy on the civilian population.

The condition that every Muslim be furnished with a set of clothing is found nowhere but in the reports on Egypt.

The requirement that the inhabitants were to maintain roads and bridges is found in all regions except 'Irāq and Armenia - a surprising omission in the case of 'Irāq, where the countryside is intersected by waterways. One can only assume that this was taken for granted, as part of the landowners' normal responsibilities in maintaining their estates.

The Muslims seem to have always been anxious to enlist the co-operation of the local population as spies and guides, and for general advice and assistance. These conditions appear in all regions.

The imposition of severe penalties for cursing or striking Muslims is mentioned only in the Persian reports, apart from one

¹Dennett, 59, 69.

unreliable report for Syria.¹ This reflects the fierce opposition that was encountered in Persia compared with all the others, and the necessity for the Muslims to maintain their authority in an insecure environment.

In conclusion it can be said that the first condition, tolerance for other religions, is in accord with the spirit of the Muslims in the time of the early conquests, compared with the situation which sometimes prevailed in later periods. The other terms are such as would be required by any prudent army commander for the well-being of his troops, the maintenance of his lines of communications, and the establishment of authority.

The taxation systems installed, or taken over, by the Muslims have already been discussed in the commentaries for the regions. To reiterate briefly: in Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia these included a land-tax, a poll-tax, and the provisioning of the Muslims. In 'Iraq there was also a land-tax and a poll-tax, together with a variable tax on crops which depended on the yield. In these four countries the tax system was administered by the Muslim authorities, although in Egypt at least, the local village headmen had some responsibilities for collection and assessment.

In Khurāsān revenue was collected by fixed tributes, the amounts of which were agreed with the local rulers. Each ruler

¹Syria, No. 91.

collected the tribute from his own subjects, and the method of assessment on individuals was by land-tax and poll-tax. The Muslims had no say in the methods of collection and assessment, however, as long as the correct sum was forthcoming. The rulers presumably gathered as much tax as they were able to extort, paid over the tribute, and kept the surplus.

For the other provinces in Persia, and for Armenia, there is less information about fiscal conditions. It is probable that the local rulers were responsible for the assessment, collection, and delivery of the revenue, in some cases as a fixed tribute, in others as an amount which could vary as the population increased or decreased. In either case the sum was almost certainly collected in the form of land-tax and poll-tax.

CONCLUSION

It was a contention of Caetani's that the Muslim jurists and historians falsified much of the evidence relating to the Arab conquests in order to bring this history into line with their own principles: 'in un modello conforme ai loro principi ideali'.¹ It is hardly necessary to refute this statement in detail. For a given region there are certainly variations between different versions of the same event, but a broad pattern emerges for the history of the conquest and pacification of that region. When this pattern has been defined it is then seen that the situation in each region had characteristics that clearly differentiated it from the situation in the remainder.

In Egypt Byzantine power was broken by the battle of 'Ayn Shams and the reduction of Babylon - a factor which contributed to the Arab success was the weakening of central authority in Constantinople after the death of Heraclius. This lack of direction from the centre was as important a cause of the surrender of Alexandria as were the Arab victories. Despite the resistance of some Delta towns, the occupation of the whole of Egypt was the inevitable sequel to the destruction of the Greek regular army and the fall of Alexandria.

The Syrian campaign hinged upon the battle of the Yarmūk.

¹Ca 23/518.

Once this had been fought and won, it remained only for the Arabs to occupy the countryside and reduce, one by one, the towns and cities. This was not done without opposition, especially in the cases of Jerusalem, Caesarea, some coastal towns, and a few towns in the north. The cities of the interior, including Jerusalem, remained peaceable once they had surrendered, but it was necessary to station garrisons in the ports and on the northern frontier to guard against Byzantine counter-attacks.

The final campaign in 'Irāq presents the simplest picture of all. Victory at Qādisiyya left the entire country at the mercy of the Muslims. Al-Madā'in was entered without opposition, and the countryside was quickly and permanently occupied.

The conquest of Persia was slow and difficult: resistance was stubborn, the terrain was difficult, and the Muslims were inexperienced in siege warfare. In the early stages the Muslim armies were too small to consolidate their victories, and it was only when they increased in size due to the arrival of fresh immigrants from Arabia that they were able finally to subjugate the central Persian provinces. At the death of 'Uthmān, and for some time afterwards, the Muslim hold on the northern and eastern provinces was extremely insecure.

The conquest of Mesopotamia was relatively rapid compared

with that of Persia, but it was still necessary to reduce the fortified cities one by one. Most of the conquests were by capitulation - the population was largely Monophysite and there were large numbers of Arabs settled in the region, so there was not the same will to resist as existed in the Iranian lands.

The history of the conquest of Armenia is bound up with the power struggle between Islam and Byzantium - the province was not finally conquered until the Caliphate of Mu'āwīya. It does not appear, however, that Ḥabīb b. Maslama met with determined resistance during his campaign, probably because Theodorus had already made formal submission to Mu'āwīya.

The assessment of the effect of the Termination of Hostilities upon the military and political situation in the conquered areas has already been touched upon in the discussions for the individual regions. The difficulty in making a judgement of this kind is that there is no firm standard against which to measure the Muslim achievement. One could, of course, point to the fact that large areas entered the fold of Islam, and that Syria, 'Irāq, Egypt, and North Africa were eventually Arabicised. These developments, however, lay in the future, and were the product of many forces, which had but little connection with the factors which led to the success of the early conquests.

Omitting those areas which were not fully pacified by the death of 'Uthmān, the remainder can be divided into two basically dissimilar regions - Īrān on the one hand, Syria, 'Irāq, Egypt and Mesopotamia on the other. For in the case of Īrān it is virtually certain that the Muslim attitude to conditions of surrender had little effect upon the course of the conquests or their immediate aftermath. The conquests were achieved by continual attrition of a stubborn enemy, resistance finally being broken by weight of numbers. In general terms there was no question of Persian hostility being weakened by the attractions of the Muslim code of behaviour.

The situation in the other countries was quite different. The population in 'Irāq was Semitic, and there was a considerable Arab element in Syria and Mesopotamia. The inhabitants of Syria, Egypt and Mesopotamia were Monophysite, and had long suffered persecution from the Melkites, engendering a hatred that persisted long after the Muslim conquests, as a reading of John of Nikiou or Michael the Syrian will confirm. In 'Irāq the Nestorian Christians had also suffered persecution, intermittent but severe in its incidence, at the instigation of the Magian priesthood. All these factors disposed the populations of these countries to accept the Arabs without active hostility.

The distinctive features of the surrender terms, as reported in the sources, are the granting of amān, and the tendency to abide

by the non-fiscal terms of the treaties once they had been ratified. The whole body of the evidence points to these tenets having been scrupulously observed by the Muslims in most cases, at least by the time that the raiding phase of the conquests was over. Amān, as has been noted, continued the time-hallowed Arab usage of jiwār while the binding nature of treaty obligations was sanctified by the example of Muhammad. This is not to deny that infringements occurred, or to ignore the jurisprudential tendencies which sometimes cause these two features to be over-emphasised. When all has been taken into account, however, it is concluded that the evidence on these two points is acceptable: that the Muslims were prepared to grant protection and religious freedom to the conquered, and not lightly to set aside these undertakings once they had been made.

These scruples do not seem to have operated to the same extent in matters of taxation. The taxes imposed in the early period may have been light - in many cases they may simply have consisted of a small tribute and the supply of provisions and other necessities to the Muslims. When 'Umar came to Syria in 638/17 he probably introduced the poll-tax graded according to class, and the first systemisation of the land-tax. The tax burden, and irregularities in the collection and allocation of revenue of revenue became more pronounced in the Caliphate of 'Uthmān.¹

¹See Ibn A'tham, 1-42.

In the first years after the conquests, however, the burden was probably no heavier, and may well have been lighter, than it was under the old dispensation.

It is likely, therefore, that feelings of racial kinship and comparison of Muslim tolerance with previous oppressions, combined with a taxation that was no heavier than before, made the indigenous population disposed to accept Muslim rule. The fact that guarantees of protection and religious liberty were written into the surrender documents may have played a part in persuading them that their new masters intended to act equitably.

The mood was probably one of acquiescence rather than enthusiasm, but it seems that this was sufficient to allow the Muslims to employ their scanty forces on extending their conquests, rather than dispersing them in garrisons. Garrisons were posted in frontier regions to guard against attacks from beyond the borders, but there is no mention of any forces having been deployed to maintain internal order. The passivity of the conquered peoples was itself very valuable to the Muslims in allowing them to extend their conquests from secure bases.

